

Ms. L1

SLP $\frac{m}{c}$

11-2

Presented to the Theo. Seminary
at Princeton, N.J.

By Mr. James Adger

LIBRARY

OF THE

Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Case, 5CC Division,
Shelf, 2303 Section,
Book, v. 1 No.,

26

2 2 5 11
Greene Library.

James L. Thompson

THE
DIVINE LEGATION
OF
M O S E S
DEMONSTRATED,
ON THE
Principles of a RELIGIOUS DEIST,
From the Omission of the Doctrine of a
FUTURE STATE
OF
REWARD and PUNISHMENT
IN THE
JEWISH DISPENSATION.

In SIX BOOKS.

BY
WILLIAM WARBURTON, A.M.
AUTHOR of *The Alliance between Church and State.*

ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΟΝ ΤΟΥΣ ΟΦΘΑΛΜΟΥΣ ΜΟΥ
ΚΑΙ
ΚΑΤΑΝΟΗΣΩ ΤΑ ΘΑΥΜΑΣΙΑ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΝΟΜΟΥ ΣΟΥ. *Psal.*

L O N D O N :

Printed for FLETCHER GYLES, against *Gray's Inn*
in *Holborn.* MDCCXXXVIII.

1738

ADVERTISEMENT

TO THE

R E A D E R.

THE following Sheets make the first Volume of a Work, whose Contents are to be found in a Book intituled, The Alliance between Church and State. As the Author was neither indebted, nor engaged to the Public, he hath done them no Injury in not giving them more; and had they not had this, neither he nor they, perhaps, had esteemed themselves Losers. For writing for no Party, it is likely he will please none; and begging no Protection, it is more likely he will find none. And he must have more of the Confidence of a modern Writer than falls to his Share, to think of making much way with the feeble Effort of his own Reason. For so homely is the Treat which he has here prepared for his Reader, that he is not conscious of borrowing a single Thought from any one, which he has not fairly acknowledged.

Writers, indeed, have been oft betrayed into strange absurd Conclusions from an obsolete Claim of Letters, to the Patronage of the Great: A relation, if indeed there ever was any, long since expired and gone; the Great seeming now to be reasonably well convinced, that it had never any better Foundation than the rhe-

ADVERTISEMENT.

torical Importunity of Beggars: An Incumbrance upon every high Station; and of no very good Example to the Public: the Protection of Bankrupt Letters being too like that which is sometimes apt to be graciously afforded to other kinds of Insolvents.

But however this Claim of Patronage may be understood; there is another Point of Patronage of a more important Nature; which is, that of Religion. The Author begs leave to assure those who have neither Ears to hear, nor Hearts to understand, I mean any Thing, but what concerns the Public Good, that the Protection of Religion is indispensably necessary to all Governments: and for his Warrant he offers them the following Volume; which endeavours to shew the Necessity of Religion in general, and of the Doctrine of a future State in particular, to Civil Society, from the Nature of Things, and the universal Consent of Mankind. The proving this, I make no doubt, many Politicians will esteem sufficient: But those who are solicitous to have Religion true as well as useful, the Author will endeavour to satisfy in the second Volume.

TO THE

FREE-THINKERS.

GENTLEMEN,

AS the following Treatise was written for your Use, you have the best Right to this Address. I could never approve the Custom of dedicating Books to Men whose Professions made them quite Strangers to the Subject. To see a Discourse on the Ten Predicaments addressed to a Leader of Armies, or a System of Casuistry to a Minister of State, always appeared to me a high Absurdity.

Another Advantage I have in this, is, that I shall not lie under any Temptations of Flattery, which, at this time of Day, when every Topic of Adulation has been exhausted, will be no small Ease to us both.

Not but I must own you have been managed, even by some of our Order, with very singular Complaisance. Whether it was, that they affected the Fame of Moderation, or the higher Ambition of *your good word*, I know not; but I, who neither love your Cause, nor

fear the Abilities that support it, while I preserve for you that Justice and Charity which my Profession teaches to be due to all, can never be brought to think otherwise of you, than as the Despisers of the Master whom I serve, and as the implacable Enemies of that Order, to which I have the Honour to belong. And as such, I could glory in your Censures; but would certainly refuse your Commendations.

Indeed was it my Design, in the manner of modern Dedicators, to look out for powerful Protectors; I do not know where I could sooner find them, than amongst the Gentlemen of your Denomination: For nothing, I believe, strikes the serious Observer with more Surprise, in this Age of Novelties, than that strange Propensity to Infidelity, so visible in Men of almost every Condition: Amongst whom the Advocates of Deism are received with all the Applauses due to the Inventers of the Arts of Life, or the Deliverers of oppressed and injured Nations. The glorious Liberty of the Gospel is forgot amidst our Clamours against a pretended Ecclesiastic Tyranny; and we slight the Fruits of the restored Tree of Knowledge, for the sake of gathering the barren Leaves of misgrafted Free-thinking.

But mistake me not, here are no Insinuations intended against Liberty: For surely, whatever be the Cause, it would be unjust to ascribe it to the Freedom of the Press; which, though it be the Midwife, as it were, to these Monsters

Monsters of the Brain ; yet, at the same time that it facilitates the Birth, it lends a *forming* Hand to the Issue: For, as in natural Bodies, become mishapen by suffering Violence in the Conception, or by too long Imprisonment in the Womb, a free unrestrained Exposition of the Parts may, in time, restore them to their natural Rectitude ; so crude and rickety Notions, cramped by Restraint, when permitted to be drawn out and examined, may, by the Reduction of their Obliquities, and the Correction of their Virulency, at length acquire Strength and Proportion.

Nor less friendly is this Liberty to the generous Advocate of Religion : For how could such a one, when in earnest convinced of the Strength of Evidence in his Cause, desire an Adversary, whom the Laws had before disarmed ; or value a Victory, where the Magistrate must triumph with him ? Even I, the meanest in this Controversy, should have been ashamed of projecting the Defense of *the great Jewish Legislator*, did not I know, that his Assailants and Defenders skirmished under one equal *Law of Liberty*. And if my dissenting, in the Course of this Defense, from some common Opinions needs an Apology, I should desire it might be thought, that I ventured into this Train with greater Confidence ; that I might shew by not intrenching myself in authorized Speculations, I put myself upon the same footing with you, and would claim no Privilege that was not enjoyed in common.

This Liberty then may you long possess ; know the Use of ; and be grateful for the Blessing ! I say this, because one cannot, without Indignation, observe, that amidst the full Enjoyment of it, you still continue, with the meanest Affectation, to fill your Prefaces with repeated Clamours against the Difficulties and Discouragements attending the Exercise of Free-thinking : and, in a peculiar Strain of Modesty and Reasoning, make use of this very Liberty to persuade the World you still want it. In extolling Liberty we can join with you ; in the Vanity of pretending to have contributed most to its Establishment, we can bear with you ; but, in the low Cunning of pretending still to lie under Restraints, we can neither join nor bear with you. There was indeed a Time, and that within our own Memories, when such Complaints were seasonable and of use ; but, happy for you, Gentlemen, you have outlived it : All the rest is merely Sir *Martin*, who continued to fumble at the Lute, though the Music had been long over : For it is not a Thing to be disguised, that all we hear from you, on this Head, is but an awkward, though envenomed Imitation of an Original Work of one, whoever he was (for as I do not pretend to guess, so neither should you) who appears to have been amongst the greatest and most successful of your Adversaries. It was published at an important Juncture, under the Title of, *The Difficulties and Discouragements which*

D E D I C A T I O N.

which attend the Study of the Scriptures. But with all the Merit of this beautiful Satire, it has been its Fortune not only to be abused by your bad Imitations, but to be censured by those, in whose Cause it was written; I mean the real Friends of Religion and Liberty. An Author of Note thus expresses himself:—^a Nor was this the worst: Men were not only discouraged from studying and revering the Scriptures by — but also by being told that this Study was difficult, fruitless, and dangerous; and a public, an elaborate, an earnest dissuasive from this Study, for the very Reasons now mentioned, enforced by two well known Examples, and believed from a Person of great Eminence in the Church, hath already passed often enough through the Press, to reach the Hands of all the Clergymen in Great Britain and Ireland: God in his great Mercy forgive the Author! Seriously it is a lamentable Case! — That any well meaning Man should so widely mistake the End and Design of another; or not see, by the Turn and Cast of the Difficulties and Discouragements, that it is a thorough Irony, addressed to some hot Bigots then in Power, to shew them what dismal Effects that inquisitorial Spirit, with which they were possessed, would have on Literature in general, at a Time when public Liberty looked with a very sickly Face! That he

^a *Religion examined with Candour, in the Preface.*

should

should not, I say, see this, but believe on the Contrary, that it was really intended as *a public, an elaborate, an earnest Dissuasive from the Study of the Scriptures!* But I have so charitable an Opinion of the great Author, for a great Author without Doubt he was, as to believe that had he foreseen, the Liberty that animates this fine turned Piece of Railery, would have given Scandal to any good Man, he would, for the Consolation of such, have made any reasonable Abatement in the Vigour of his Wit and Argument.

But you, Gentlemen, have a different Quarrel with him: You pretend he hath since wrote on the other Side the Question. Now though the Word of his Accusers is not apt to go very far with me, yet I must own, I could be easily enough brought to believe, that an Author of such Talents of Literature, Love of Truth, and of his Country, as this appears to have been, would as freely expose the extreme of Folly at one End as at the other; without regarding what Party he opposed or favoured by it. And it is well known, that at the Time this is pretended to have been done, another Interest being become uppermost, strange Principles of Licence, which tended to subvert all Order, and destroy the very Essence of a Church, ran now in the popular Stream. What then should hinder a Writer, who was of no Party but that of Truth, to oppose this Extravagance, as he had done its Opposite? And if he pleased neither Bigot nor Liber-
tine

tine by his Uniformity of Conduct, it was because they were so.

How rare, how excellent, how public a Blessing, is such a Virtue! that dare equally oppose the different Extremes of Parties; and stand, as the Poet says,

*Unaw'd by Danger of Offence,
The fatal Enemy of Sense.*

But to return to our Subject: — The poor thread-bare Cant of the Want of Liberty, I should hope then you would be at length, persuaded to lay aside: But that I know such Insinuations are amongst your Arts of Controversy; and that something is to be allowed to a weak Cause, and a Reputation that requires managing. We know what to understand by it, when after a successful insult on Religion, the *Reader* is entreated to believe that you have a strong Reserve, which only waits the setting open the larger Port of Liberty, yet shut against you.

Thus at the very Entrance of your Works, you teach us what we are to expect. But I must beg your Patience now I am got thus far, to lay before you your principal Abuses of that Liberty indulged to you for better Purposes; or to give them the softest Name I can, in an address of this Nature, your ARTS OF CONTROVERSY.

By this, I shall at once practise the Charity I have professed, and justify the Opinion I have passed upon you.

Your
I

Your Writers, I speak it, Gentlemen, to your Honour, offer your Considerations to the World, either under the Character of Petitioners for oppressed and injured Truth; or of Teachers to ignorant and erring Mankind. These are Characters sure, that if any, require Seriousness and Gravity to support them. But so great a Stranger to Decorum, for the most Part, is Man, on his Entry on the Stage of Life, that (like *Bays's* Actor in the *Rehearsal*, who was at a loss to know whether he was to be serious or merry, melancholy or in love) he runs on in a strange jumbled Character; but has, most an end, a strong Disposition to make a Farce of it, and mingle Buffoonry with the most serious Scenes. Hence in religious Controversy, even while the great Cause of eternal Happiness is trying, and Men, and Angels, as it were, attending the Issue of the Conflict, we can find room for a merry Story; and receive the Advocate of Infidelity with much welcome, if he comes but with a Disposition to make us laugh: Though he brings the Tidings of *Death*, and scatters round him the Poison of our *Hopes*, yet like *the dying Assassin*^b, we can laugh along with the Mob, though our own Agonies and Despair concluded the Entertainment.

This Quality in a Writer making him so well received, yours have been tempted to dispense with the Solemnity of their Chara-

^b *Balthazar Gerard*, who murdered the *Prince of Orange*.

ster; as thinking it of much Importance to get the Laugh on their Side. Hence *Ridicule* is become your favourite Figure of Speech; and your Writers have composed distinct Treatises to vindicate its Use, and manifest its Utility. But to be fair with you, it must be owned, that this extravagant Disposition in the Reader, towards unseasonable Mirth, drives all Parties upon being witty where they can. As being conscious of its powerful Operation in Controversy: Ridicule having from the Hands of a skilful Disputant, the same Effect with the new invented Darts^c of *Marius*, that though so weak as to break in the throw, and pierce no farther than the Outside, yet sticking there, they more entangle and incommode the Combatant, than those Arms which fly stronger, and strike deeper. However, an Abuse it is, and one of the most Pernicious, of the Liberty of the Press. For what greater Affront to the Severity of Reason, the Sublimity of Truth, and the Sanctity of Religion, than to subject them to the impure Touch of every scurrilous Buffoon? The Politeness of *Athens*, which you pretend so much to admire, should be here a Lesson

^c Δείλαι — πρῶτον ὑπὸ Μαρίας κληρονομήσει τὸ πρὸς τὰς ὕσας· τὸ γὰρ εἰς τὴν σιδῆραν ἔμβλημα ἔξυλον, πρῶτον μὲν ἂν θεοὶ πειράσας κατεκλημμένον σιδῆρας· τότε δὲ ὁ Μάριος τὸ μὲν, ὡς περ εἶχεν, εἰσάσσει· τὸ δ' ἐτέραν ἐξελών, ξύλινον ἔλκον εὐθραστοὶ ἀντ' αὐτῆς ἐπέβαλε· τεχνάζων προπαρονοῖα τὴν ὕσιν τῷ θιγῶν ἔξυλινον καὶ πολέμου μὴ μῦθεν ὄρθον, ἀλλὰ ἔξυλινον κλαοθέντος ἔλκε, καμπὴν γίνεσθαι περὶ τὴν σιδῆραν, καὶ παρέλκεσθαι τὸ δόρυ ὅτε τὸ σπέρμα τῆς αἰχμῆς ἐνεχόμενον. *Plut. Vit. Mar.*

to you ; which committed all Questions of this Nature, when they were to be examined, to their gravest and severest Court the *Areopagus* : whose Judges would not suffer the Advocates for either Part, to apply to the Passions, so much as by the common Rules of the chastest Rhetoric^d. But a preposterous Love of Mirth has turned you all into Wits, quite down from the mercurial Writer of *the independent Whig*, to the atrabilaire Blasphemer of the Miracles. Though it would be but Charity to tell you a plain Truth, that *Tully* told your *illustrious Predecessors* long ago, when infected with the same Distemper : “ Ita sa-
 “ lem istum, quo caret vestra natio, in irri-
 “ dendis nobis nolitote consumere. Et me-
 “ hercule, si me audiatis, ne experiamini qui-
 “ dem. Non decet : non datum est : non
 “ potestis.” However, if you will needs be witty, take once more your Example from the great Author of *The Difficulties* : and learn from him, the Difference between the *Attic* Irony, and Elegance of Wit, and your intemperate Scurrility, and illiberal Banter.

What a Noise you will say, for a little harmless Mirth. — Ah Gentlemen ! if that was all, you had my leave to Laugh on : I would say with the old Comic,

Utinam malè qui mihi volunt, sic rideant.

^d See *Lucian de Gymnasis*.

But low and mean as your Buffoonry is, it is yet to the Level of the People: and by it you *lead Captive, silly Fellows, laden with Sins, led away with divers Lusts*, who are as little solicitous, as capable of the Point of Argument, so they can but catch the Point of Wit. Amongst such, and to such you write: and it is inconceivable what Havock false Wit makes in a foolish Head: *The Rabble of Mankind*, as an excellent Writer well observes, *being very apt to think, that every thing which is laughed at, with any Mixture of Wit, is ridiculous in itself^e.*

But one, in whom your Party most glories, has wrote in Defense of this abusive Way of *Wit and Raillery*, on serious Subjects. Let us hear him then^f: *Nothing is ridiculous, except what is deformed: nor is any thing Proof against Raillery, except what is handsome and just: And therefore it is the hardest Thing in the World to deny fair Honesty the Use of this Weapon; which can never bear an Edge against herself. One may defy the World to turn Bravery or Generosity into Ridicule: A Man must be soundly Ridiculous, who with all the Wit imaginable, would go about to ridicule Wisdom, or laugh at Honesty or good Manners. — Yes, ridiculous indeed, to laugh at Bravery, Generosity, Wisdom, Honesty, or good Manners as such: And I hardly think,*

^e Mr. Addison's Works, vol. 3d. p. 293. Quarto.

^f Characteristicks, vol. 1. Essay on the Freedom of Wit and Humour.

Gentlemen,

Gentlemen, as licentious as some of you are, you will be ever brought to accept of this *Defy*. And why need you, when it is but shewing them with over-charged, and distorted Features, to laugh at Leisure. Call them but Temerity, Prodigality, Gravity (which some of you Wits tell us is a Cover for a Sot) Simplicity, Foppery, and, as you have oft experienced, the Business is done. And what Security will this Writer give us that they shall not be so called? I am persuaded, if you are never to be thought *ridiculous*, till you become so, in the Way this Gentleman marks out, you may go safely on in the *Freedom of Wit and Humour*, till there be never a Virtue left, to laugh out of Countenance.

But he will say, he means such clear Virtue as has no equivocal Mark about her for a Prevaricator to lay hold of: Admit it, our Wit will then clap her on a Fool's Coat; and when he cannot make her ridiculous in her Person, will make her so in her Equipage.

However, will he say, this shews at least, that nothing can be done against her till she be disguised. A mighty Consolation this to expiring Virtue, that she cannot be destroyed till you have put her on a Fool's Coat. As if it was as hard to get one *on*, as *Hercules's off*, though in the Reverse of this there is a greater Likeness; and we have frequently seen, that when once *on*, it sticks as close as that envenomed one of old, and lasts her to her Funeral.

But

But if this noble Writer means that these clear unquestioned Virtues cannot be obscured, however attempted to be disguised, nor consequently, become ridiculous, however represented; nothing can be falser. This I shall shew in two celebrated Instances: In the first it will be seen, that nothing could be stronger than the Ridicule, nor, at the same Time, more open and transparent than the Disguise; in the latter, nothing more obscured than the Beauty of the moral Reflexion ridiculed, nor more out of Sight than the Falshood of the pretended Representation; which will both teach us, that any kind of Disguise will serve the Turn, and, that witty Men will never be at a loss for one.

Of all the Virtues that were so much in this noble Writer's Heart, and in his Writings, there was not one he more adored than LOVE OF PUBLIC LIBERTY, or which he would less suspect liable to the Impressions of Buffoonry. I think I hear him say, *One may defy the World to turn the Love of public Liberty into Ridicule: A Man must be soundly ridiculous, who with all the Wit imaginable would go about it.*

However, once on a time, a certain great Wit set upon this Task; and undertook to laugh at this very Virtue; and that too, so successfully, that he set the whole Nation a Laughing with him. What mighty Engine you will ask was employed to put in Motion so large a Body; and for so extraordinary a Cause?

Cause? Why in good faith, as the Clown in *Shakespear* says, *But a Trifle neither, if the Learned should speak Truth of it*: It is a Discourse, of which all the Wit consists in the Title, *Mrs. Bull's Vindication of the indispensable Duty of CUCKOLDOM, incumbent upon Wives, in Case of the Tyranny, Infidelity, or Insufficiency of Husbands*. All the Wit, you see, sculks under one unlucky Word. And had the Reader bethought himself, that Reason was the true Measure of Ridicule; he would have seen to rectify the Proposition, and to state it fairly thus:

The indispensable Duty of DIVORCE, &c.

And then the Joke had been over, before the Laugh could have been begun.

And now let this noble Writer tell us, as he does, that *fair Honesty can never bear an Edge against herself, for that nothing is ridiculous but what is deformed*; and a deal to the same Purpose, which his *Platonic Manners* had supplied him with.

But very often the Change put upon us, is not so easily discernible. *Sulpicius* tells *Cicero*, that returning by Sea from *Asia*, and seeing in his Courte *Ægina*, *Megara*, the *Piræus*, and *Corinth* in Ruins, he fell into this very natural and humane Reflexion: *And shall we, short lived Creatures as we are, bear with Impatience the Death of our Fellows, when in one single View, we behold the Carcass-*

es of so many lately flourishing Cities^h. What could be juster or wiser than the Piety of this Reflexion? And yet it could not escape the Ridicule of a celebrated *French Buffoon*: *If neither, says heⁱ, the Pyramids of Egypt, nor the Colosseum at Rome, could withstand the Injury of Time, why should I think much that my Black Waistcoat is out at Elbows?* Here indeed the first thing remarkable, is the irresistible Force of Truth.

The Buffoon, before he could throw an Air of Ridicule on this admirable Sentiment, was forced to change the Image. And in the Place of *Ægina, Megara, &c.* to substitute the Pyramids and Colosseum. For the latter of

^h *Ex Asia rediens, cùm ab Ægina Megaram versus navigarem, cœpi regiones circumcirca prospicere. Post me erat Ægina: antè Megara: dextra Piræus: sinistra Corinthus: quæ oppida quodam tempore florentissima fuerunt, nunc prostrata, & diruta ante oculos jacent. Cœpi egomet mecum sic cogitare: Hem! nos homunculi indignamur, si quis nostrum interiit, aut occisus est, quorum vita brevior esse debet, cùm uno loco tot oppidum cadavera projecta jaceant? L. 4. Ep. 5. Sulpicius M. T. Ciceroni.*

ⁱ *Superbes monumens de l'orgueil des humains,
Piramides, Tombeaux, dont la vaine Structure
A temoigné que l' art, par l' adresse des mains
Et l' assidu travail, peut vaincre la Nature!
Vieux Palais ruinez, chef-d'oeuvres des Romains,
Et les derniers efforts de leur Architecture,
Collisée, où souvent ces peuples inhumains
De s' entr' assassiner se donnoient tablature,
Par l' injure des ans vous estes abolis,
Ou du moins la plus-part vous estes demolis:
Il n'est point de ciment que le temps ne dissolue.
Si vos marbres si durs ont sentis son pouvoir,
Dois-je trouver mauvais qu' un meschant pour point noir,
Qui m' a duré deux ans, soit percé par le coude?*

*Scarron.
these,*

these, as they were the Works of human Pride, and Folly, easily suffered a ridiculous Turn. But the former, as free Cities, and the Nurseries of Arts and Commerce, being the noblest Efforts of human Wisdom and Virtue, could not be set in any idle Light.

But then how few of his Readers could detect the Change put upon them, when it is highly probable the Author himself did not see it? Who, perplexed at the obstinate Resistance of Truth, in the Concourse of Ideas, imperceptibly turned the Edge of his Raillery against the Phantasm of it, and was the first that fell into his own Deceit.

Hence may be seen what the noble Writer seems to have spoke at random, at least not at all to the Purpose of the Question he was upon, that such indeed, is the inflexible Nature of Truth, that all the Wit in the World can never render it ridiculous, till it be distorted to shew like Error, or disguised to appear like Folly. A Circumstance which, though it prodigiously recommends the *Majesty of Virtue*, yet as it cannot secure it from Insult, doth not at all shew the *Innocence of Ridicule*; which was the Point he had prove.

But you will say perhaps, let Truth, when thus attacked, defend itself with the same Arms. For why, as your Master asks, should *fair Honesty be denied the Use of this Weapon*? Be it so. Come on then, and let us impartially attend the Issue. We have, upon Record, the most illustrious Example of this Conflict

fiſt that ever was. The Diſpute I mean, was between *Socrates* and *Ariſtophanes*. Here Truth had all the Advantage of Place, of Weapons, and of Judges: The firſt employed his whole Life in the Cauſe of Virtue: The other only a few Comic Scenes againſt it: But Heavens! againſt what Virtue? Againſt the pureſt and brighteſt Exemplar of it, that ever aroſe amidſt the *Pagan* World. The Wit of *Ariſtophanes* is well known: That of *Socrates* was, in a ſupreme Degree, juſt, delicate, and ſtrong; and, ſo continued, that he went under the Name of the *Attic Buffoon*. The Place was the politeſt State, in the politeſt Time; *Athens* in its Glory: And the Judges the grave Senators of *Areopagus*. For all this, the Comic Poet triumphed: And with the coarſeſt kind of Buffoonry, little fitted, one would think, to take ſo polite a People, had the Art to tarniſh all this Virtue; and what was more, to make the Owner reſemble his direct Opposite, that Character he was moſt unlike, that very Character he had employed all his Time and Wit to detect and confound; in one Word, the SOPHIST. The Conſequences are well known.

Thus will Raillery, in Deſenſe of Vice and Error, be ſtill an Over-match for that employed on the Side of Truth and Virtue. Becauſe fair Honesty uſes, though a ſharp, yet an unſtained Weapon; while Knaveſy ſtrikes with one empoisoned, but much duller. The honeſt Man employs his Wit as correctly as his Logic:

whereas the very Definition of a Knave's Buffoonry is a Sophism.

I hope then, Gentlemen, you will be at length brought to acknowledge this Method to be the most Unfair and Pernicious, that a sincere Searcher after Truth can be betrayed into: That its natural Effect is to obscure the Understanding, and to make the Heart dissolute.

It is a small Matter the State requires of you, Sobriety, Decency, and good Manners, to qualify you for the noble Employment of thinking freely, and at large. — We have been told this, you will say, before. But when it came to be explained, by *sober Writing* was meant, writing in the *Language of the Magistrate*. This may be true, but then, remember, it was not till yourselves had led the Way to the Abuse of Words; and had called Calumny, Complaint; and a scurril License, Urbanity. Happy for you that you are in Times when Liberty is so well understood. Had you lived in the boasted Days of ancient Freedom, he amongst you, that had escaped best, had been branded with a Character they esteemed most infamous of all, AN ENEMY TO THE RELIGION OF HIS COUNTRY. An excellent Person, and one of your most formidable Adversaries, speaking of the ancient Restraints on Free-thinking, says — *These were the Maxims, these the Principles, which the Light of Nature suggested, which Reason dictated*. Nor

* *Letter to Dr. Waterland, p. 52 and seq.*

has this fine Writer any Cause to be ashamed of this Acknowledgment; nor his Adversaries any Pretence that he must needs esteem it the Measure for the present Times. For, as a great Ancient well observes, ἄλλως τις πρὸς ἀληθείας λέγει, ἄλλως ἢ ἀλήθεια ἐαυτὴν ἐρμηνεύει. It was Christian TRUTH and CHARITY, the Truth and Charity you so much insult, which only could take off those Restraints; and require no more of you than to be *as free, and not using your Liberty for a Cloak of Maliciousness.*

I have now done with your Buffoonry; which, like chewed Bullets, is against the Law of Arms; and come next to your Scurrilities, those Stink-pots of your offensive War.

The Clergy of the established Church, being the Men, who amongst us have been principally watchful in the common Cause of Christianity, and most successful in repelling the Insults of its Enemies, have fallen under the heaviest Load of your Calumny and Slander. With unparallel'd Licence, you have gone on, representing the whole Body as debauched, avaricious, proud, vindictive, ambitious, deceitful, irreligious, and incorrigible. *An order of Men profligate and abandoned to Wickedness, inconsistent with the good of Society, irreconcilable Enemies to Reason, and Conspirators against the Liberty and Property of Mankind¹.* And so low have you descended in your Ri-

¹ *Rights of the Christian Church, and Christianity as old as the Creation, passim.*

baldry, as to descant upon their very *Hats and Habit*^m. This is the Conduct of your Leaders. For I would not be so hard upon you, as to expect you should be answerable for the Disorders of the loose undisciplined Rabble, the forlorn Hope, that roll together in the *Old Whig*, and follow the Camp only for Mischief and Plunder.

To fill up your common Place of Slander, the most inconsistent Qualities are raked together to adorn them: Qualities that could never stand together but in Idea; and in the Idea of a Free-thinker too.

The Order is now represented as the most contemptible of Politicians, ever in the Wrong; and under a Fatality of continued Blunders, attending them as a Curse: — But anon, we are alarmed with their deep laid Schemes of a separate Interest, so wisely conducted, as to elude and baffle all the Policy of Courts, and Wisdom of Legislatures.

Now they are a Set of superstitious Bigots; *Blind Leaders of the Blind*; red hot Zealots, always prompt to sacrifice the Rights of Humanity, to what they call the Cause of God: But now again, they are a *Cabal of mere Politiques*; *Tartufes without Religion*; *Atheists in Black Gowns*; *Apostates without Faith or Law*.

Now so closely united in one common Confederacy, that they make their Cause the Cause of Religion; *rising together like a Nest*

^m *The Independent Whig*, passim.

of *Hornets*, to revenge an Insult done to one of their Body, while they leave no Ways untried to screen their offending Brethren from Punishment: — But on a sudden, this wise and close Policy is dissolved: The Church is become a State of Anarchy; and the Clergy are perpetually tearing and worrying one another; to the great Scandal of that pious Christian, the Author of the *Discourse of Free-thinking*.

But it is to be hoped, as the Evidence is so ill packed, the whole Accusation may be groundless.

You will say, that in this you do but copy from our own Accounts; which being given of ourselves, may surely be depended on. I know indeed there has been a *Hickeringall* of old, a *Woolston* of late, and perhaps, one or two more, happier in their Obscurityⁿ. But these are monsters rarely seen, and universally detested. I wonder our Ancestors could conceive this to be a Degeneracy likely for any Race of Animals to fall into; as they seem to have done, by their coarse Proverb of an *Ill Bird*. I, for my part, know of none but the *Fail Bird*, and one or two of *these*, that speak Evil of the Places to which they belong: And both for the same Reason, because they had been brought to Justice there.

But if the whole Body cannot escape you, what must the Particulars of it expect at your Hands? And where must we believe you would drop your Virulence, but on those, whose

ⁿ See the Paper called the *Old Whig*.

Eminence exposes them to the Blasts of Calumny?

Is there a Prelate, who has been more than ordinary successful in the Cause of common Christianity? He is sure to be stigmatized for a *Jacobite*, and an Enemy to his Country°.

Is there another, whose Vigilance and Firmness secures the just Rights and Immunities of the established Church? Such a one is *the express Image of Priestcraft, with insolent Grimace, and powerless Formality*°.

But what talk I of the Clergy, when there is not one, however otherwise esteemed by, or related to you, that can escape your Slander, if he happens to discover any kind of Inclination for that Cause, against which you are so virulently bent? Mr. *Locke*, the Glory of this Age, and the Blessing of Futurity, shews us in the Treatment he received from his Friend and his Pupil, what a Believer is to expect from you. It was enough to provoke their Spleen, that he had shewn *the Reasonableness of Christianity*, and had placed all his *Hopes of Happiness in another Life*. The Intimacy between him and Mr. *Collins* is well known. Mr. *Collins* appears to have idolized Mr. *Locke* while living, and Mr. *Locke* was confident Mr. *Collins* would *protect his Memory when dead*³. But no sooner was he gone, than

° See *The Answer to the Country Parson's Plea*, p. 101.

† See p. 100. of the same Tract.

‡ *I know you loved me living, and will preserve my Memory now I am dead*, says he in the Letter to be delivered to Mr. *Collins* at his Death.

Mr.

Mr. *Collins* publicly^r insults a Notion of his, concerning the *Possibility of conceiving how Matter might first be made, and begin to be*: And goes affectedly out of his Way to do it. The noble Author of *the Characteristics* had received^r part of his Education from this great Philosopher: And it must be owned, that this Lord had many excellent Qualities, both as a Man, and a Writer. He was temperate, chaste, honest, and a Lover of his Country. In his Writings he has shewn how largely he had imbibed the deep Sense, and how naturally he could copy the gracious Manner of *Plato*. How far Mr. *Locke* contributed to the cultivating these Qualities, I will not enquire: But that inveterate Rancour he indulged against Christianity, it is certain, he had not from him. It was Mr. *Locke*'s love of it that seems principally to have exposed him to his Pupil's bitterest Insults. One of the most precious Remains of the true Piety of this incomparable Man, are his last Words to Mr. *Collins*:

“ May you live long and happy, &c. all the
 “ Use to be made of it is; *that this World is*
 “ *a Scene of Vanity that soon passes away, and*
 “ *affords no solid Satisfaction*, but the Consci-
 “ ousness of well doing, and the HOPES OF
 “ ANOTHER LIFE. This is what I can say
 “ by Experience, and what you will find when

^r *Answer to Dr. Clarke's 3d. Defense of his Letter to Mr. Dodwell, at the End,*

^f *Voiez Bib. Choisie, tom. 6. p. 343.*

“ you come to make up your Account.” One would imagine, that if ever the parting Breath of pious Men, or the last Precepts of dying Philosophers could claim Reverence of their Survivors, this inestimable Monument of Friendship, and Religion, had been secure from Outrage. Yet hear, in how unworthy, how cruel a Manner, his noble Disciple apostrophizes him on this Occasion: “ *Philosopher!* “ let me hear concerning Life, what the right “ Notion is; and what I am to stand to upon “ Occasion: That I may not, when Life seems “ retiring, or *has run itself out to the very* “ *Dregs**, cry VANITY! condemn the “ WORLD, and at the same Time complain “ that LIFE IS SHORT AND PASSING. For “ why so *short* indeed if not found *sweet*? or “ why do I complain both Ways? Is *Vanity*, “ mere Vanity a Happiness, or can Misery “ *pass away too soon*?” I will leave the strange Reflexions, that naturally arise from hence, to the Reader; who, I am sure, will be beforehand with me in judging, that Mr. Locke had Reason to condemn a World that afforded such a Friend and Pupil.

But

* Mr. Locke was then in his 73d Year.

“ *Characteristics*, vol. 1. p. 302. 3d Ed.

“ The spite he bore his Master, is inconceivable. He did not disdain to take up with those vulgar Calumnies that Mr. Locke had over and over confuted. Some even (says he *Characteristics*, vol. 1. p. 80. 2d Ed.) of our most admired modern Philosophers had said, told us, that *Truth and Vice* had, after all, no other Laws or Masters, than mere *Fashion and Figue*. The Cue is this. When Mr. Locke reasons against innate Ideas, he brings it a

But to return, Gentlemen, to your Abuse of the Clergy: This is not only an insult on Religion, which you seem by your Practice, to regard as one of the necessary Branches of literary Liberty, but likewise on Civil Society. For while there is such a Thing as a Church *established by Law*, the *Ministry* of it must needs bear a *sacred* Character, that is, a public one; even on your own Principles*. Any In-

one Argument against them, that Virtue and Vice in many Places, were not regulated by the Nature of Things, which they must have been, were there such *innate Ideas*; but by mere Fashion and Vogue. Is this then *fairly told of our admired modern Philosopher*? But it was Crime enough that he laboured to overthrow *innate Ideas*; things that the noble Author understood to be the Foundation of his *Moral Sense*. (See vol. 3d. p. 214.) In vain did Mr. Locke incessantly repeat, that, *the Divine Law, is the only true Touch-stone of moral Rectitude*. This did but increase his Pupil's Resentment, who had all his Faculties so possessed with the MORAL SENSE, as *the only true Touch-stone of moral Rectitude*; that, like the Knights Errant of old, he stood up Challenger against all Opposers, for the superior Charms of his *Idol*. But the whole Essay itself, one of the noblest, the usefullest, the most original Books the World ever saw, cannot escape his Ridicule: *In Reality* (says he, vol. 1. p. 299.) *how specious a Study, how solemn an Amusement, is raised from what we call philosophical Speculations! the Formation of Ideas! their Compositions, Comparisons, Agreement, and Disagreement! — But why do I concern myself in Speculations about my Ideas? what is it to me, for Instance, to know what kind of Idea I can form of Space? "Divide a solid Body, &c."* and so he goes on in Mr. Locke's own Words: And lest the Reader should not take the Satire, a Note at the Bottom of the Page informs us, that *these are the Words of the particular Author cited*. — But the invidious Remark on this Quotation surpasses all Credit. — Thus the Atomist, or EPICUREAN. The Free-thinkers after this, can never fure upbraid us with our Flippancy in giving the Deist and Atheist to those we do not like, when the very Hero of their Cause is thus taken in the Fact.

* They also that have Authority to teach, &c. are public Ministers. Leviathan, p. 124.

sult therefore offered to them as a Body, becomes an Affront to the State that conferred the Character. It is an high Injury likewise, because a Body politic cannot preserve the Veneration necessary for the support of its Authority, longer than its public Officers, whether Civil or Religious, receive the Reverence due to their respective Stations^v. And here, the Excuse you make, when charged with treating holy Writ irreverently, is out of doors. You pretend *that* is unjust; because it takes for granted the Thing in Dispute. But in this Case, it is allowed on all Hands, that the Ministry of the established Worship has a sacred, that is, a public Character.

Out of your own Mouths, likewise, are you condemned. A few Instances there are in the first Ages of Christianity, of something resembling this Misconduct; where the Intemperance of private Zeal, now and then gave the Affront to the national Religion. But who are they that so severely censure this accidental Disorder? that raise such tragic Outcries against the factious Spirit of primitive Christianity? Who but yourselves, the very Men who out of Libertinism and Wantonness, daily persist in doing what a misguided Devotion, now and then, though rarely, betrayed a Martyr to commit.

^v "Ἀρχαῖον ἡ ὀφειλομένη αἰδώς καὶ τιμὴ συντακτομένη κόσμῳ σωζέει πόλιν, καὶ ἀφαιρείται. Ant. Scrip. apud Stob. de rep. Sermon. 41.

But would you read Christian Antiquity with equal Minds, you would not want Examples of a better Conduct. For in general the Apologists for the Christian Faith observed a Decency and Moderation, becoming the Truth and Importance of the Cause they had to support. We need only look into *Lactantius* for the Continenence they practised in this Regard.

This eloquent Apologist, who wrote in an Age that would have indulged greater Liberties, giving in his *Divine Institutions* the last Stroke to expiring Paganism, where he confutes the *national Religion*, spares as much as possible the *Priests*; but in exposing their *Philosophy*, is not so tender of their *Sophists*: For these last having no public Character, the State was not concerned to have them managed.

Nor can you plead, Gentlemen, in your Excuse, that you lie under any Necessity, but that inseparable from a weak Cause, of committing this Outrage. The Discovery of Truth is so far from being advanced by it, that on the Contrary it carries all the Marks of Disingenuity, when you so industriously draw off the Reader's Attention from the *Cause*, by diverting him at the Expence of the Advocate.

It is true, that at what Time the Ministry so far forgot the Nature of their Office, and of the Cause they were entrusted to defend, as to call in the secular Arm to second their Arguments against wrong Opinions, we saw without much Surprize or Resentment, you Gentlemen, in the same Delusion of a contrary
Extreme;

Extreme; falling without scruple to affront the State, then little disposed to give you a favourable Hearing; by abusing a Body, whose private Interests the State had indiscreetly espoused. For where was the Wonder, when the State had assumed too much, for those oppressed by it, to allow it too little. They thought this a fair Reprisal, and their candid Enemies allowed that some Indulgence was to be given to the Passions of Men, raised and enflamed by so unjust a Treatment. But now, that the State hath withdrawn and confined its Power within its proper Office; and that, that learned Body, as such, publicly disclaims its Aid; it will sure be expected, you should likewise return to a right Mind; and forsake a Practice insolently continued, without any reasonable Pretence or Provocation.

Your last Abuse, Gentlemen, of the Liberty of the Press, is in that Dissoluteness of Mind, regardless of Truth and Falshood; which you betray in all your Attacks of Revelation. Who that had not heard of your solemn Professions *of the Love of Liberty, of Truth, of Virtue, of your Aim at the Honour of God, and good of Man*, could ever believe you had any thing of this in View, by the Spirit of Levity, that animates your Writings?

That you may not say I slander you, I will produce those Marks in your Writings, on which I have formed my Accusation, of this abandoned Disposition.

1. The first is an illimited Buffoonry; which suffers no Test or Criterion to your Ridicule, that may shew, when you are in jest, and when in earnest.

2. An industrious Affectation to keep your true Personage out of Sight; and the perpetually assuming some new fictitious Character.

3. A Love of Chicane and Contradiction; supported by a monstrous Mixture of Scepticism and Dogmatizing.

And here, Gentlemen, in illustrating these three Characters of your Guilt, I could detect all the *Arts of Controversy* in use amongst you; and display the whole Mystery of modern *Free-thinking*. But the Limits of this Address will only permit me to describe in a few Words, the Nature of each of them, in order to shew how certain Notes they are of the Temper of Mind I charge upon you.

1. The illimited undistinguished Irony, that leaves no Marks of Insight into the Author's Meaning, is our first Note. This, which is your Favourite Extravagance, the noble Author, who was so much your Friend, calls² *a dull sort of Wit which amuses all alike*. Nay, he even ventures to pronounce it *a gross, immoral, and illiberal Way of Abuse, foreign to the Character of a good Writer, a Gentleman, or Man of worth*³. 'Tis pity he himself should fall under his own Censure: But this is certain, there is no Way of escaping his Admir-

² *Charact.* vol. 1. Tract 2. pt. 1. § 24.

³ Vol. III, Miscel. 4. c. 2.

ers, uncharged of Credulity or Uncharitableness, which way soever we determine of his *real* Sentiments. However he has not overloaded the Extravagance, in the Character he has given of it: For here, quite forgetful of your own Precepts (which is your common-place Topic against public Instructors) while you prescribe Ridicule to be so managed, *as to shew it tends to a serious Issue*; you practise it on all Subjects so indiscriminately, as to make one think you are all the while in jest. While you direct it *to unmask formal Hypocrisy*, you suffer it to put sober Truth out of Countenance; and while you claim its Aid, *to find out what is to be laughed at in every thing*; you employ it to bring in every thing to be laughed at.

That a Restraint on free Enquiry, will force Writers into this vicious manner, we easily allow. Under those Circumstances, such a Key to Ridicule as just Writing demands, being unsafe; and the only Way to escape Persecution, to cover and intrench themselves in Obscurity; it is no Wonder that *Ridicule* should degenerate into the *Buffoonry* that *amuses all alike*: As in *Italy*, which gave Birth to this Species of Writing, it is the only Way, in which the poor cramped thinking Wretches can discharge a free Thought. But happily for Truth, in *Great Britain*, you, the Geniuses of the Times, are free; and may philosophize at your Ease, through all the Modes of doubting, objecting, and confuting.

Much

Much less Reason have you to suspect your good Reception in the World, if you speak without Disguise. You have a Cause that will bear you out, and supply all your Deficiencies: A Cause which now-a-days so sanctifies the Character of the Advocate, that we have seen Writers of each of the learned Professions, who, while they confined their Pens to their proper Sciences, with Difficulty made themselves so far known as to be despised; but have no sooner struck into this high Road to Fame, and wrote against the Religion of their Country, than they have become great and terrible Authors; and even recovered in a good Measure, from the Contempt of their own Faculties. For Infidelity has the Virtues of *Lord Peter's brown Loaf*, and contains inclusively the Quintessence of Learning, Wit, and Argument.

It is not possible for us then, to assign any other reasonable Cause of the Extravagance, than that vicious Levity of Spirit we complain of. For as Man is formed by Nature with an incredible Ardency of Appetite for the Pursuit of Truth; so his strongest Pleasure, in the Possession of it, arises from the actual Communication of it to others. Without this, it would be a cold Purchase, would be abstract, ideal, solitary Truth; and poorly repay the Labour and Fatigue of the Search. Amongst the Ancients, who, it must be owned, had high Notions of this *social Sense*, it was a Say-

ing recorded by Cicero with Approbation^b, that even Heaven would be no Happiness, without some one, to whom to communicate the great Truths, were there to be discovered.

“ Si quis in cœlum ascendisset, naturamque
 “ mundi, & pulcritudinem siderum perspe-
 “ xisset, insuavem illam admirationem ei fore;
 “ quæ jucundissima fuisset, si aliquem, cui nar-
 “ raret, habuisset.” Seneca goes yet farther^c:

Nec me ulla res delectabit, licet eximia sit & salutaris, quam mihi uni sciturus sim. Si cum hac exceptione detur Sapientia, ut illam inclusam teneam, nec enunciem, rejiciam: nullius boni, sine socio, jucunda possessio est. It was this Passion that gave birth to Writing, and formed literary Composition into an Art; in order to perpetuate those Discoveries in the Sciences, which Particulars had, with so much toil and labour of Mind, fitted up for public Entertainment. The principal Concern therefore of the Writer, while his Passions are in their natural State, must needs be to deliver and explain his Sentiments and Opinions with all possible Perspicuity. So as no particular Cast of Composition, or Turn of Expression, which he judged conducive to the Embellishment of his Work, may be able to throw any Ambiguity over it, that shall tend to mislead his Reader concerning his real Sentiments. To such a one nothing can be a more mortifying Reflection, than to find his chief Design become defeated.

^b De Amicitia.

^c Ep. 6.

But when on the Contrary, we see a Writer so far from discovering any thing of this Passion, that an Air of Negligence appears in every thing he delivers; a visible Contempt of his Reader's Judgment, to whose Satisfaction he prefers a malicious kind of Pleasure, arising from the Obscurity of an illimited Ridicule; we cannot possibly avoid concluding him far gone in this wretched Depravity of Heart.

2. Another Mark, is your perpetually assuming some personated Character, as the Exigences of Chicane require. For the Dispute is to be kept on foot; and therefore, when the Matter is in danger of coming to an Issue, a new Personage is to be assumed, that the Contest may be fought over again with different Weapons. So that the modern Free-thinker, as may be seen by the Coryphæus^d of your Choir, is a perfect *Proteus*. He is now a Dissenter, now a Papist, now again a Jew, and now a Mahometan; and, when closely pressed and hunted through all these Shapes, at length starts up in his genuine Form, an Infidel confest.

Indeed where the Magistrate has confined the Liberty of free Debate, to one or two Professions, there a Writer differing from these, has no way of publishing his Speculations, but under the Cover of one of these authorized Professors. But to affect this Manner after the Necessity is over, is licentious and im-

^d Mr. Collins.

ral. For the personated Character, only arguing *ad hominem*, embroils rather than directs us in the Search of Truth; has a natural Tendency to promote Scepticism; and if not this, yet keeps the Dispute from coming to an Issue; which is attended with great Inconveniencies. For though the Discovery of speculative Truth be of much Importance to the Perfection of Man's Nature, yet the affected lengthening out literary Debates, is greatly prejudicial to Society, as Societies are generally formed. Therefore, though the good of Mankind would set an honest Man upon publishing what he takes to be Discoveries in Truth; yet the same Motive would oblige him to take the fairest, and most direct Road to their Reception.

But I would not by this, have it thought, that I condemn the assuming a personated Character on any occasion whatsoever. There are Seasons when it is fair and expedient. Then when the Dispute is about the practical Application of some Truth to the good of a particular Society; there it is fair to take up a suitable Character, and argue *ad hominem*. For there the End is a Benefit to be gained for that Society; and it is not of so great Moment, on what Principles the Majority is prevailed with to make the Society happy, as it is, that it should speedily become so. But in the Discovery of abstract speculative Truth, the Affair goes quite otherwise. The Business here is *Demonstration*, not *Persuasion*. And it is of the Essence of Truth, to be made to appear

pear and shine out only by Truths drawn from itself, as the *Dust* only can polish the *Diamond*.

A famous Example will illustrate this Observation. Our great *British* Philosopher, writing for *Religious Liberty*, combats his *intolerant* Adversary, quite through the Controversy, with his own Principles; well foreseeing that, in such a Time of Prejudices, Arguments built on received Opinions, would have greatest Weight, and make quickest Impression on the Body of the People, whom it was his Business to gain. But see now the different Method this excellent Person employed when defending a mere speculative Truth. A Prelate of great Name, was pleased to attack his *Essay concerning human Understanding*; who though consummate in the Learning of the Schools, yet applied his Principles so very awkwardly, as gave our Philosopher the most inviting Opportunity of retorting them upon him. A Triumph the most to the Taste of him who contends only for Victory: But he contended for Truth; and was too wise to think of establishing it on Falshood; and too honest to affect triumphing over Error by any thing but by its Opposite.

You see then, Gentlemen, you cannot escape by this Distinction: The Dispute with you is about speculative Truth: Yourself take Care to give the World repeated Information of it, as often as you think fit to feign an Apprehension of the Magistrate's Resentment.

But of as little Use as this Method, of the *personated Character*, is in itself, to the just End of Controversy, you generally add a double Share of Disingenuity in conducting it. Common Sense, as well as common Honesty, requires that he who assumes a *personated Character*, should fairly stick by it, for that Turn at least. But we shall be greatly deceived, if we presume on so much Condescension: The late famous Author of *The Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*, took it into his Head to personate a *Jew*, in the Interpretation of some Prophecies which he would persuade us are not applicable to *Jesus*. The illustrious Prelate, who so solidly confuted him, having shewn that those Prophecies had no Completion under the Jewish Dispensation, concludes with all the Advantage of a full Answer, *that therefore if they did not belong to Jesus, they belonged to no one*. What says our Impostor *Jew* to this? One would be astonished at the Infidel's Reply: *Suppose they do not*, says he, *I am not answerable for their Completion*. What! not as a *Jew*? whose Person he assumes, and whose Argument he borrows: which Argument is not founded on this, — That the Characters of Completion, according to the *Christian* Scheme, do not coincide and quadrate: — to which indeed, his Answer would be pertinent; but on this: — That there are compleat Characters of the Completion of the Prophecies, under the *Jewish* Oeconomy, and therefore, says the *Jew*,

Jew, you are not to look for those Marks under the *Christian*. The only reasonable Way then of replying to this Argument, is to deny the Major, that there are such Marks under the *Jewish* Oeconomy; which if the *Jew* cannot prove, his Objection founded on a *prior Completion*, is entirely overthrown. Instead of replying to this, we are put off with the cold Buffoonry of, *I am not obliged to find a Meaning for your Prophecies*.

3. The third Mark of this abandoned Spirit, is that monstrous Mixture of Scepticism, and Dogmatizing, which deforms all your Writings. I do not mean by it, that unreasonable Temper of Mind, which distinguishes the whole Class of Free-thinkers; and suffers you at the same Time, that you affect much Scepticism, in rejecting Revelation, to dogmatize very positively on some favourite Points of Belief. The noble Author, so oft before quoted, could not himself forbear to ridicule his Party for this Foible*. *It must certainly, says he, be something else than Incredulity which fashions the Taste and Judgment of many Gentlemen, whom we hear censured as Atheists. — Who if they want a true Israelitish Faith, can make amends by a Chinese or Indian one. — Though Christian Miracles may not so well satisfy them, they dwell with the highest Contentment on the Prodigies of Moorish and Pagan Countries.*

* Vol. i. p. 345. *Charact.* 3d Ed.

This is ill enough, but the Perversity I mean, is infinitely worse : And that is when the same Writer, on different Occasions assumes the Dogmatist and Sceptic on the very same Question ; and so abuses both Characters, by the most perverse Self-contradictions.

For instance, how common is it for one of your Writers, when he brings *Pagan* Antiquity to contradict and discredit the *Jewish*, to cry up a *Greek* Historian as an Evidence, to which nothing can be replied ? An imperfect Hint from *Herodotus*, or *Diodorus*, though one lived a Thousand, and the other fifteen Hundred Years after the Point in Question, picked up from any lying Vagabond they met in their Travels, shall now outweigh the circumstantial History of *Moses* ; who wrote of his own People, and lived in the Times he wrote of. But now turn the Tables, and apply the Testimony of these Writers, and of others of the best Credit of the same Nation, to the Confirmation of *Jewish History*, and then nothing is more uncertain and fallacious than ancient Records. All Antiquity is Darkness and Confusion : Then we are sure to hear of,

*Quicquid Græcia mendax
Audet in historia.*

Then *Herodotus* is a lying Traveller, and *Diodorus Siculus* a hasty Collector.

Again, when the Choice and Separation of the *Israelites* for God's peculiar People, is to be

be brought in Question, and rendered ridiculous, then are they to be represented as the vilest, most profligate, and perverse Race of Men. Then every indiscreet Passage of a *declamatory Divine* is raked up with Care to make them odious; and even the hard Fate of the great Historian *Josephus* pitied, that he had *no better a Subject than such an illiterate, barbarous, and ridiculous People*^f. But when the Evangelical Account of the Treatment, the Holy *Jesus* met with from these People, is thought fit to be disputed, these *Jews* are become an humane and wise Nation; which interfered not with the Teachings of Sects, or the Propagation of Opinions, but where the public Safety was thought in Danger by seditious Doctrines.

But so it is, even with the Bible itself; and its Interpreter, human Reason. It is generally allowed that the Author of *The Discourse of Free-thinking*, and of *The Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*, was one and the same Person. Now it being his Design in the first Pamphlet, to blast the Credit of the Book in general, as a Rule of Faith, the Bible is there represented as a most obscure, dark, incomprehensible Collection of multifarious Tracts. But in his *Discourse of The Grounds, &c.* where^g he is to obviate the Reason we draw, of the Difficulty in explaining ancient Prophecies, from the Genius of the

^f *Discourse of Free-thinking*, p. 157.

^g P. 68.

Eastern Style and Sentiment, on a sudden, this very Book is become so easy, plain, and intelligible, that none can possibly mistake it.

Again, the same Writer, where in his *Essay concerning the Use of Reason*, he is upon Discrediting the Doctrine of the ever blessed Trinity, and other Mysteries of the *Christian* Faith, represents human Reason as omniscient, and the full Measure of all Things: But when the Proof of the Immateriality of the Soul, from the Qualities of Matter and Spirit, is to be obstinately opposed, the Scene is shifted; and we are presented with a new Face of things: Reason is then become weak, staggering, and impotent: then^h we know not but one Quality may be another Quality; one Mode another Mode: then may Motion be Consciousness; and Matter Sentient.

These, Gentlemen, are the several Ways, in which you have abused the Liberty of the Press. One might defy you, with all your good Will, to find out a new one; or to go farther in the old: So having done your worst, it is time you should think of doing better. This is the only Conclusion I would draw from your ill Conduct: So far am I from thinking with those, who say you ought to be disfranchized of the Rights you have so wantonly and wickedly abused. For could the simple Abuse so easily incur a Forfeiture, natural Rights would be strangely hazardous. Ad-

* See his Answers to Dr. Clarke.

ventitious Rights are, 'tis true, frequently bestowed on this Condition. And the Difference in point of Security, is founded in the plainest Reason. *Natural* Rights are so necessary to our Being, that, without them, Life becomes miserable; but the Civil only contributing to our easier Accommodation in some circumstantial Matters, may be lost without Injury to our common Nature. The not distinguishing between them, may have occasioned the Mistake: For the *common Lawyers*, being solely conversant in these latter, and having judged that the Abuse of these incurs a Forfeiture; have sometimes rashly adventured to decide the Rights of Nature by the same Standard. But these Rights were bestowed on no such precarious Conditions: Nay, which deserves the most serious Reflection of all Men in Power, so far was God from exacting this Penalty, at that Period, when these Rights were most outrageously abused, that he not only continued, but enlarged and extended them: While on the Contrary,

“ Man, proud Man,
 “ Drest in a little, brief Authority,
 “ Plays such fantastic Tricks before high
 “ Heaven,
 “ As make the Angels weep.

But it will be said, the particular Authors however of these Abuses should be personally punished. I will here again, Gentlemen, become
 your

your Advocate; not for your own Sakes, who surely deserve Punishment; but for the Public's, which cannot, I think, inflict it, without great Mischief to literary and religious Liberty.

Abuses of natural Rights are of two kinds; which we should always carefully distinguish: The first is of such Malignity, as to invalidate, and even destroy the *Use*: And being of the Nature of a simple Fact, leaves no room for recurring to a venal Judge's Interpretation: These Properties demand Punishment, as making it both necessary and safe. But there is another kind of *Abuse* that destroys not, but only discredits the *Use*; and in which the Matter of Right being intricately involved in the Matter of Fact, a Magistrate has the largest Latitude of Interpretation: Here Punishment, for very obvious Reasons, is neither necessary nor safe. That the *Abuse of Ridicule* is of this latter kind, is evident. But besides these two kinds of *Abuse*, which we may call Original, there are two others, derivative from these, and compounded of them: As *first*, an *Abuse* that only discredits the *Use*: though it be of the Nature of a simple Fact: and of this kind is that, which is the Subject of the second Head of this Discourse; namely, *the Defamation of the Ministry of the established Worship*. *Secondly*, an *Abuse* that destroys the *Use*; but where yet the Matter of Fact is intricately involved in the Matter of Right: of which kind is the Subject of our third Head; namely, *a*
vicious

vicious disregard to Truth and Falshood. Now in neither of these Cases, should I think it right for the State to interfere: In the *first* it is not necessary, in the *second* it is not safe: And I presume it to be a Maxim in Politics, not to punish, but where these two *Qualities of Necessity and Safety* concur.

In a Word then, all that we desire, is your Amendment; without any sinister Aim of calling upon the Magistrate to quicken you. So I leave you, as I dare say will *be*, to your selves.

Mend when you can, grow better at your Leisure.

Nor let any good Man be scandalized above Measure for your Faults; or be more impatient for your Reformation, than mere Charity requires. I don't know what Panic the present monstrous growth of Infidelity may have thrown some of us into. I, for my part, confide so much in the Goodness of our Cause, that I too could be tempted to laugh in my Turn, while I think of an old Story told us by *Herodotus*, of your favourite *Egyptians*; of whom you are like to hear a great deal in the following Work. With this Tale I shall beg leave to conclude my long Address to you.

He tells us then, that at what Time their Deity, the *Nile*, returns into his ancient Channel, and the Husbandman hath committed the good Seed to the opening Glebe, it was
their

their Custom to turn in whole Drovers of Swine; to range, to trample, root up, and destroy at Pleasure. And now nothing appeared but Desolation, while the Ravages of the obscene Herd had killed every chearful Hope of future Plenty. When on the Issue, it was seen, that all their Malice and Greediness had effected, was only this; that the Seed took better Root, incorporated more kindly with the Soil, and at length shot up in a more luxuriant and abundant Harvest.

I am,

GENTLEMEN, &c.



A
S U M M A R Y
O F T H E
C O N T E N T S.

VOL. I. IN THREE BOOKS :

*Containing the Necessity of Religion in general,
and of the Doctrine of a future State in par-
ticular to Civil Society, proved from the Na-
ture of Things, and the universal Consent
of Mankind.*

B O O K I.

PROVES the Necessity of the Doctrine of a fu-
ture State of Rewards and Punishments to Ci-
vil Society, from the Nature of the Thing, —
p. 1 — 86.

S E C T. I.

CONTAINS the Introduction, concerning the
Nature of internal Evidencè; the Occasion of this Dis-
course, and the Proposition, p. 1 — 9.

CONTENTS.

SECT. II.

OF the Original of Civil Society; the Causes of its defective Plan: that this Defect can be only supplied by Religion: that Religion under the present Dispensation of Providence cannot subsist without the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments; that therefore that Doctrine is necessary to Civil Society, p. 9 — 24.

SECT. III.

THE Arguments of those who deny the Necessity of Religion to Society considered: Pomponatius falsely ranked in that Number, and vindicated: Cardan characterized and censured, p 24 — 33.

SECT. IV. and v.

Mr. Bayle, the great Defender of this Paradox in his Apology for Atheism, examined. His Arguments collected, methodized, and confuted. In the Course of this Disputation, the true Foundation of Morality is enquired into, and shewn to be neither the essential Difference of Things, nor the Moral Sense, but the Will of God. The Causes of the contrary Errors shewn: And the Objections against Morality's being founded in the Will of God, answered, p. 33 — 78.

SECT. VI.

THE Author of the Fable of the Bees, who contends that it is Vice and not Virtue that is useful to Society, examined, exposed, and confuted, p. 78 — 86.

BOOK

CONTENTS.

BOOK II.

PROVES the Necessity of the Doctrine of a future State to Society, from the Conduct of the ancient Legislators, and Founders of Civil Policy, p. 87 — 295.

SECT. I.

SHEWS the Magistrate's Care in cultivating Religion. 1. From the Universality of it, amongst all civil policed Nations. 2. From the Genius of Pagan Religion, both with regard to the Nature of their Gods, the Attributes assigned to them, and the Mode of Worship in civil Use amongst them, p. 87 — 102.

SECT. II.

BEGINS with the particular Arts the Legislator employed to this Purpose : As 1. the universal Practice of pretending to Inspiration. It is shewn that this was done to establish the Opinion of the Superintendency of the Gods over human Affairs : Not to secure the Reception of their Laws ; nor to render those Laws perpetual and immutable when received, p. 102 — 111.

SECT. III.

SHEWS the next Art the Legislator used was to preface his Laws with the Doctrine of a Providence in its full Extent. The Prefaces to the Laws of Zaleucus and Charondas, the only Remains of this kind, proved genuine against the Arguments of a learned Critic, p. 111 — 133.

CONTENTS.

SECT. IV.

THE next Art here discoursed of, is the Legislators Invention of the Mysteries, solely instituted for the Propagation and Support of the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments. Their Original and Progress deduced: Their Nature and End explained: Their Secrets revealed: And the Causes of their Degeneracy accounted for. And to give a compleat Idea of this important Institution, the sixth Book of Virgil is examined, and the Descent of Æneas into Hell, is shewn to be only an Initiation into, and Representation of the Shews of the Mysteries, p. 133 — 231.

SECT. V.

SHEWS the next Instance of the Magistrate's Care of Religion, in establishing a national Worship. That an established Religion is the universal Voice of Nature. The Right of establishing a Religion justified, in an Explanation of the true Theory of the Union between Church and State. This Theory applied as a Rule to judge of the actual Establishments in the Pagan World. The Causes that facilitated the Establishment of Religion amongst them; as likewise those Causes that hindered their Establishments from receiving their due Form, p. 231 — 266.

SECT. VI.

TREATS of the last Instance of the Magistrate's Care for the support of Religion, namely, in the Allowance of a general Toleration: The Measure and Causes of it: The Nature of the ancient tolerated Religions: How, under the Supervision and Direction of the Magistrate: And how first violated and destroyed by civil Tyranny, p. 266 — 295.

BOOK

CONTENTS.

BOOK III.

PROVES the Necessity of the Doctrine of a future State to Society, from the Opinion and Conduct of the ancient Sages and Philosophers, p. 295 — 443.

SECT. I.

CONTAINS the Testimonies of ancient Sages and Philosophers, concerning the Necessity of the Doctrine of a future State to Civil Society, p. 295 — 303.

SECT. II.

BEGINS with shewing that none of the ancient Philosophers believed the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, though, on account of its confessed Necessity to the Support of Religion, and consequently of Civil Society, all the Theistical Philosophers sedulously taught it, and preached it up to the People. The several Senses in which the Ancients conceived the Permanency of the human Soul explained. The several general Reasons premised that induced the Author to conclude that the ancient Philosophers did not always believe what they taught, and that they taught the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments without believing it : Where the Principles that induced the ancient Sages to deem it lawful to deceive for public good, in matters of Religion, are explained, and shewn to be such as had no Place in the Propagation or Genius of the Jewish and Christian Religions. In the Course of this Enquiry, the Rise, Progress, Perfection, Decline, and Genius of the ancient Greek Philosophy, under its several Divisions, are considered and explained, p. 303 — 325.

SECT.

CONTENTS.

SECT. III.

ENTERS on a particular Enquiry into the Sentiments of each Sect of Philosophy on this Point. The Division and Succession of their Schools. The Character of Socrates; and of the new and old Academy. The Character and Genius of each Sect of the grand Quaternion of Theistic Philosophy, the Pythagoric, the Platonic, the Peripatetic, and the Stoic: Where it is shown that not one of these believed the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments. The Character of Tully, and his Sentiments on this Point. The Original of the ancient Fables, and of the Doctrines of the Metempsychosis and Metamorphosis, are occasionally enquired into and explained, p. 325 — 367.

SECT. IV.

SHEWS, in order to a fuller Conviction, that the ancient Philosophers not only did not, but that they could not possibly believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments, because two metaphysical Principles, concerning the Nature of God, and of the human Soul, which entirely overturn the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, were universally held and believed by all the Greek Philosophers. These Doctrines examined and explained: In the Course of this Enquiry, the true Genius of the ancient Egyptian Wisdom explained; and their pretended Philosophy, as delivered by the later Greek Writers, shown to be spurious. The Section concludes with the Use to be made of this remarkable Fact (of the ancient Philosophers not believing, and yet sedulously teaching a future State of Rewards and Punishments) for the Support of our main Question, p. 367 — 410.

SECT.

CONTENTS.

SECT. V.

SHEWS that this account of the ancient Philosophy, is so far from being prejudicial to Christianity, that it greatly credits and recommends it. Proved from the Mischiefs that attend those different Representations of Paganism, in the two Extremes, which the Defenders of Religion are accustomed to make: Where it is shewn that the Difference in point of Perfection, between the ancient and modern Systems of Morality, is entirely owing to Christianity, P. 411 — 415.

SECT. VI.

THE atheistical Pretence of Religion's being an Invention of Statesmen, and therefore false, is here confuted, and shewn to be both impertinent and false. For that, was the Atheist's Account of Religion right, it would not follow that Religion was false, but the contrary. But that the Pretence is false and groundless, Religion having existed before the Civil Magistrate was in being, P. 415 — 443.

of the first Kind, these Materials of Defense are inseparable from its Existence ; and so always at hand, and the same. But Time may, and doth efface Memorials independent of that Existence ; out of which the *external* Evidence is composed. Which Evidence must therefore become more and more imperfect, without being affected by that whimsical and partial Calculation, to which a certain *Sectiman*^a would subject it. Nay, so necessary is the *internal* Evidence, that, even the very best of the *external* Kind cannot support itself without it : As may be seen from hence, that when the Miracles, performed by the Founders of our holy Faith, are unquestionably verified, by human Testimony, the Consequence, that therefore they were wrought by divine Power, cannot be deduced 'till the Nature of that Doctrine be examined, for whose Establishment they were performed. But was there no other Benefit accruing from the Cultivation of the *internal* Evidence than the gaining, by it, a more perfect Knowledge of revealed Religion, this, surely, would fully recompense the Pains. That this is one of its Fruits I need not tell such as are acquainted with its Nature : And it is not without Occasion I take notice of it : For who, in this long Controversy between us and the Deists, hath not applied, to certain late Advocates of Revelation, what was formerly said of *Arnobius* and *Lactantius*, that they undertook the Defense of Christianity before they understood it : A Misfortune, which the more careful Study of the *internal* Evidence would probably have prevented. Notwithstanding these superior Advantages, it hath so happened, that the *internal* Evidence hath been hitherto used as an Introduction only to the *external* : and while by this

^a Craig. Theologiae Christ. Principia Mathematica, Lond. 1699. 4^{to}.

latter,

latter, Men have proved our Religion actually divine, they have gone no farther with the former, than to shew it worthy indeed of such Original. But, from the State in which the *internal* Evidence, at present, lies, a late Writer^b hath drawn a quite contrary Conclusion. I, from the small Progress hitherto made in it, exhort to its better Cultivation; he, from the same Fact, concludes, that, *strictly speaking, there can be no internal Evidence of a Revelation at all.* He supposes this small Advance to be owing to a Defect in the Nature of the Proof; I, to the Negligence of its Cultivators. Which of us is in the right, if that can be a Question, a few Pages will discover.

What may have occasioned this Neglect, is not so easy to say. Whether it be that Writers have, in general, imagined the Difficulties of effectually prosecuting the *internal* Method not to be so easily surmounted as those are, which the Writer in the *external* is engaged in: while they suppose, that this latter, to be Master of his Subject, needs only the usual Requisites of Church-history, common Diligence, and Judgment. But that the Reasoner on the *internal* Proof, must, besides these, have a thorough Knowledge of Human Nature, Civil Policy, the universal History of Mankind, an exact Idea of the *Mosaic* and *Christian* Dispensations, cleared from the Froth and Grounds of School-subtilties, and Church-systems: and, above all, should be blessed with a certain Sagacity, to investigate the Relations of human Actions, through all the Combinations of natural, civil, and moral Complexities. What may suggest this Opinion may be, the reflecting, that, in the *external* Evidence, each Circumstance of Fact, that makes for the Truth of

^b Dr. Combeare's Defense of Revealed Religion, edit. 2. 8^{vo} p. 431.

revealed Religion, is seen to do so, as soon as known: so that the chief Labour, here, is to search and pick out such Facts, and to place them in their proper Light and Situation; but that, in prosecuting the *internal* Evidence, the Case is widely different. A Circumstance in the Frame and Composition of this Religion, that perhaps some time or other may be discovered to be a Demonstration of its Divinity, shall be so far from being generally thought assisting in the Proof, that it shall be esteemed, by most, a Prejudice against it: as I think I have given a remarkable Instance, in the Subject of the following Treatise. And no wonder, that a Religion of divine Original, constituted to serve many admirable Ends of Providence, should be full of such complicated Mysteries, whose View filled the learned Apostle with Admiration. As on the other hand, this Religion being for the Use of Man, we need not despair, when we have attained a proper Knowledge of Man's Nature, and the Dependencies thereon, of making still growing Discoveries, on the *internal* Evidence of the Divinity of its Original.

Now tho' all this may perhaps be true; and that, consequently, it would appear ridiculous Arrogance in an ordinary Writer, after having seen the Difficulties attending this Method, to hope to overcome them, by the qualities above said to be required: yet no modest Searcher after Truth need be discouraged. For there are, in revealed Religion, besides those interior Marks of Truth, above described, which require the most delicate Operation of a great Genius, and Master-workman, to bring out and polish; others also, no less illustri-

† A noble Instance of this, a great Writer hath given us in the 4th *Dissertation of the Use and Intent of Prophecy*, &c. intitled, *Christ's Entry into Jerusalem*.

ous, but more univocal Marks of Truth, that God hath been pleased to impress upon his Dispensations; which require no great Qualities, but Humility, and Love of Truth, in him, who would, from thence, attempt *to vindicate the Ways of God to Man*.

The Subject of this Discourse is one of those illustrious Marks; from which, the Discoverer claims no Merit from any long, learned, or laborious Search. It is Honour enough for him that he is the first who brings it out to Observation; if he be indeed the first. For the Demonstration is so strong and beautiful, and, at the same time, appears to be so easy and simple, that one cannot tell whether the Pleasure of the Discovery, or the Wonder that it is now to make, be the greater.

The Title of this Discourse tells my Reader, that I undertake to prove the divine Legation of *Moses*, from the Omission of the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, in the Laws and Religion he delivered to the *Jewish* People. In which I pretend to carry the internal Evidence much farther than usual; even to the Height of which it is capable, Demonstration.

Why I chuse to make the Defense of *Moses* the Subject of this Discourse, is the observing a Notion to have spread very much of late, even amongst many who would be thought *Christians*, that the Truth of Christianity is independent of the *Jewish* Dispensation: An Opinion, that was, 'till now, peculiar to the *Socinians*; who go so far as to maintain, ^d *that the Knowledge of the Old Testament is not absolutely necessary for Christians*: And, that those who profess to think more soberly, are generally gone into the Belief that the Truth of

^d *Super. advers. Tract. Theol. Polic. lib. 1.*

the *Jewish* Religion is impossible to be proved but upon the Truth of the *Christian*. As to the first sort of People, if they really imagine Christianity hath no Dependence on Judaism, they deserve our tenderest Compassion, as being plainly ignorant of the very Elements of the Religion they profess. However suitable the Opinion may be to a modern fashionable Notion that *Christianity is only the Republication of the Religion of Nature*; the silliest, and most wretched Error, in an age of Paradoxes. As for the other, it is reasonable to think, they fell into the Mistake from a View of Difficulties, in the *Jewish* Dispensation, they judged too weighty to be removed. I may pretend then to their Thanks, if I succeed, by coming so seasonably to their Relief; and freeing their Reasonings from a vicious Circle, that first prove the Christian by the Jewish; and then the Jewish, by the Christian Religion.

Why I chuse this Medium, namely, *the Omission of a future State in the Jewish Dispensation* (before several others of equal Strength, which I have in my Choice) to prove its divine Original, is for the sake of the Deists: being enabled hereby to shew them, 1. That this very Circumstance of Omission, which they pretend to be such an Imperfection, as makes the Dispensation unworthy the Author to whom we ascribe it, is, in Truth, a Demonstration that God only could give it. 2. That those several momentous Passages of Scripture, which they charge with Obscurity, Injustice, and Contradiction, are, indeed, full of Light, Equity, and Agreement. 3. That their high Notions of the Antiquity of the Religion, and Learning of the *Ægyptians*, which they incessantly produce, as *their Primary Argument*, to confront and overturn the History

History of *Moses*, do, in an invincible manner, confirm and support it.

In this Demonstration, then, which we suppose very little short of mathematical Certainty, and to which nothing, but a mere physical Possibility of the contrary, can be opposed, we demand only this single *postulatum*, that hath all the Clearness of Self-evidence, namely,

“ That a skilful Lawgiver, establishing a Religion, and Civil Policy, acts with certain Views, and for certain Ends ; and not capriciously, or without Purpose or Design.

This being granted, we erect our Demonstration on these three very clear and simple Propositions :

1. “ THAT THE INCULCATING THE DOCTRINE
“ OF A FUTURE STATE OF REWARDS AND
“ PUNISHMENTS, IS NECESSARY TO THE
“ WELL BEING OF CIVIL SOCIETY.
2. “ THAT ALL MANKIND, ESPECIALLY THE
“ MOST WISE AND LEARNED NATIONS OF
“ ANTIQUITY, HAVE CONCURRED IN BELIEVING, AND TEACHING, THAT THIS
“ DOCTRINE WAS OF SUCH USE TO CIVIL
“ SOCIETY.
3. “ THAT THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE
“ OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS IS NOT
“ TO BE FOUND IN, NOR DID MAKE PART OF
“ THE MOSAIC DISPENSATION,

Propositions so clear and evident, that one would think, one might directly proceed to those Mediums by which we deduce our Conclusion,

THAT THEREFORE THE LAW OF MOSES IS OF
DIVINE ORIGINAL.

But so great is Men's Love to *Paradox* and *System*, that these, with all their Evidence, have need of a very particular Defense: the Infidel having disputed the one, and many Christian Writers thought it necessary to deny the other. These Passions, however different, with regard to the Objects that excite them, and to the Subjects in which they are found, have this in common, that they never rise but on the Ruins of Reason. The Business of the Religionist being to establish, if his Understanding be narrowed by Prejudices, he contracts himself into *System*: and that of the Infidel, to overturn; if his Will be depraved, he, as naturally, runs out into *Paradoxes*. Slavish, and licentious Thinking, the two Extreames of free Enquiry, shuts them up from, or makes them fly out beyond, all reasonable Views and Limits. And, as Extreames fall easily into one another, we sometimes see the opposite Writers change Hands: The Infidel, to shew something like Coherence in his Reveries, represents them as the several Parts of a *System*; and the Religionist, to give a Relish to his System, powders it with *Paradoxes*. In which Arts, two late *Hibernians*^c, the Heroes of their several Parties, were very notably practised and distinguished.

In removing these of either Kind, that lie in our Way, we shall be obliged to stretch our Enquiries high and wide. But this, always, with an eye to the Direction of our great Master of Reason^f, *To endeavour, throughout the Body of this Discourse, that every former Part may give Strength unto all that follow, and every latter bring some Light unto all before.*

^c See the Discourse called *Nazarenus*, — *An Epistolary Discourse concerning the Immortality of the Soul*, — *Dissertationes Cyprianicae*, See Hooker.

S E C T. II.

OUR First Proposition, THAT THE INCULCATING THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS IS NECESSARY TO THE WELL BEING OF CIVIL SOCIETY, I shall endeavour to prove, from the Nature of Man, and the Genius of Civil Society.

The Appetite of Self-preservation being most indispensably necessary to every Animal, Nature hath made it the strongest of all. And though, in rational Animals, Reason alone might be supposed sufficient to answer the End, for which this Appetite is bestowed on others, yet, the better to secure that End, Nature hath given Man, likewise, a very considerable Share of the same Instinct, with which she hath endowed Brutes so admirably to provide for their Preservation. Now whether it was some *plastic Nature* that was here in fault, which the great *Bacon* says, *knows not how to keep a mean*^s, or, that it was all owing to the perverse Use of human Liberty, certain it is, that, born away with the Pleasure of gratifying this Appetite, Man, in a State of Nature, soon ran into very violent Excesses: and never thought he had sufficiently provided for his own Being, 'till he had deprived his Fellows of the free Enjoyment of theirs. Hence, all those Evils of mutual Violence, Rapine, and Slaughter, that, in a State of Nature, must needs abound amongst equals. Because, tho' Man, in this State, was not without a Law, which exacted Punishment on Evil doers, yet, the Administration of that Law not being in common Hands (but either in the Person offended, or else in the

^s Modum tenere nescia est. *Aug. Scien.*

Hands of every one, as the Offence was against Mankind in general) would be irregularly executed. And very often, where both these Executors of the Law of Nature were disposed to be impartial and exact, in the Administration of Justice, they would yet want Power to enforce it. Which together, would so much inflame the Evils above mentioned; that they would soon become as general, and as intolerable, as the *Hobbeists* represent them in that State to be, was it not for the restraining Principle of RELIGION, that kept Men from running, altogether, into the Confusion necessarily consequent on the Principle of inordinate Self-love. But yet it could not operate with sufficient Efficacy, for want, as we observed before, of a common Arbiter, who had Impartiality enough fairly to apply the Rule of Right, and Power to enforce its Operations. So that *these two Principles* were in endless Jar; and, as Chance directed, sometimes one, and sometimes the other had the better. The restraining Principle of *Religion* therefore found it necessary to call in the CIVIL MAGISTRATE, as an Ally, to turn the ballance.

Thus was *Society* invented for a Remedy against Injustice; and a *Magistrate*, by mutual consent, appointed, to give a sanction to “that common Measure, to which, Reason teaches us, that creatures
“of the same Rank and Species, promiscuously
“born to the same Advantages of Nature, and to
“the Use of the same Faculties, have all an equal
“right.”^b Where it is to be observed, that though Society provides for all those Conveniencies and Accommodations of more elegant Life, which Man must have been content to have been without, in a State of Nature; yet it is more than probable, that these were never thought of when Society was first

institutedⁱ; but that they were the mutual Violences and Injustices, at length become intolerable, that set Men upon contriving this Remedy: Because Evil felt hath a much stronger Influence on the Mind than Good imagined; and the Means of removing the one is much easier discovered, than the Way to procure the other. And this, by the wise Disposition of Nature: the avoiding Evil being necessary to our Existence; not so, the procuring Pleasure. Besides, the Idea of those unexperienced Conveniences would be, at best, very obscure: and how unable Men would be, before trial, to judge that Society could bestow them, we may guess by observing, how little, even now, the generality of Men, who enjoy those Blessings, know or reflect that they are owing to Society, or how it procures them; because it doth it neither immediately, nor directly. But they would have a very lively Sense of Evils felt; and would know that Society was the Remedy, because the very Definition of the Word would teach them how it becomes so.

Civil Society thus established, from this Time, as the Poet says,

ⁱ Though the judicious *Hooker* thinks those Advantages were principally intended when Man first entered into Society: His Words are these: — “ But, forasmuch as we are not by ourselves sufficient to furnish ourselves with competent Store of things needful for such a Life as our Nature doth desire, a Life fit for the Dignity of Man; therefore to supply these Defects and Imperfections which are in us, living singly, and solely by ourselves, we are naturally induced to seek Communion and Fellowship with others. *This was the Cause of Men’s uniting themselves at first into Politique Societies.* Eccl. Pol. l. i. § 10. His Master *Aristotle*, though extremely concise, seems to hint, that this was but the secondary End of Civil Society, and that, that was the first, which we make to be so. His Words are: *ἡνωμένοι μὲν ὅν τινος ἕνεκεν, ὅσα δὲ τούτων.* Pol. lib. i. cap. 2.

abf:-

*abstistere Bello,
Oppida cæperunt munire, & ponere Leges,
Ne quis Fur esset, neu Latro, neu quis Adulter.*

BUT as before, RELIGION alone was an ineffectual Remedy to moral Disorders; so now, SOCIETY, without other Assistance, would be equally insufficient.

I. 1. For, *first*, its Laws can have no farther Efficacy than to restrain Men from an open Violation of Right, while what is done amiss in private, though equally tending to the publick Prejudice, escapes their Animadversion: and Man, since his entering into Society, would have greatly improved his Malice in the secret Way of working. For now an effectual Security being provided against *open Violence*, and the inordinate Principle of Self-love still the same, *secret Craft* was the Art to be improved: and the Guards of Society inviting Men to a careless Security, what Advantages this would afford to those private Mischiefs, which Civil Laws could not take notice of, is not difficult to conceive.

2. But, *secondly*, the Influence of Civil Laws cannot, in all Cases, be extended even thus far, namely, to the restraining an open Violation of Right. It cannot *then*, when the severe Prohibition of one Irregularity threatens the bringing on a greater: And this will always be the Case when the Irregularity is owing to the Intemperance of the natural Passions. Hence it hath come to pass, that no great and flourishing State could ever punish *Fornication*, in such a manner as its ill Influence on Society was confessed to deserve. Because it was always found, that a severe Restraint of this, opened the Way to worse Lusts.

3. But

3. But this was not all, there was a farther Inefficacy in human Laws: The Legislature, in enquiring into the mutual Duties and Devoirs of Citizens, arising from their Equality of Condition, found those Duties to be of two Sorts: The first, they intitled the Duties of PERFECT OBLIGATION; because Civil Laws could readily, and commodiously, and were, of necessity, required to inforce their Observation: The other they called the Duties of IMPERFECT OBLIGATION; not, that Morality does not as strongly exact them, but because Civil Laws could not conveniently take Cognizance of them; and, that they were supposed not so immediately and vitally to affect the Being of Society. Of this latter Kind are *Gratitude, Hospitality, Charity, &c.* Concerning such, Civil Laws, for these Reasons, are generally silent. And yet, though it may be true, that these Duties, which human Laws thus overlook, may not so directly affect Society, it is very certain, that their Violation brings as fatal, though not so swift Destruction upon it, as that of the Duties of *perfect Obligation*. A very competent Judge, and who too speaks the Sentiment of Antiquity in this Matter, hath not scrupled to say: — “ Ut scias
 “ per se expetendam esse grati Animi Adfectionem,
 “ nem, per se fugienda res est ingratum esse: quoniam
 “ nihil æque concordiam humani generis dissociat ac distrahit quam hoc vitium.^k”

4. But farther, besides these Duties both of *perfect* and *imperfect Obligation*, for the encouraging and inforcing of which, Civil Society was invented, Society itself begot and produced a new Set of Duties, which are, to speak in the Mode of the Legislature, of *imperfect Obligation*, unknown to

^k Seneca de Benef. lib. iv. cap. 18.

the State of Nature : the first and principal of which is that antiquated forgotten Virtue called the LOVE OF OUR COUNTRY.

5. But lastly, Society not only introduced a new Set of Duties, but likewise increased and inflamed, to an infinite degree, those inordinate Appetites, for whose Correction it was invented and introduced : like some kind of powerful Medicines, that, at the very Time they are working a Cure, heighten the Malignity of the Disease. For our Wants increase, in proportion as the Arts of Life advance and perfect. But in proportion to our Wants, so is our Uneasiness ; — to our Uneasiness, so our Endeavours to remove it ; — to our Endeavours, so the Weakness of *human Restraint*. Hence it is evident, that in a State of Nature, where little is consulted but the Support of our Existence, our Wants must be few, and our Appetites, in proportion, weak ; and that in Civil Society, where the Arts of Life are cultivated, our Wants must be many, and our Appetites, in proportion, strong.

II. Thus far concerning the Imperfection of Civil Society, with regard to the Administration of that Power which it has. We shall next consider its Imperfection with regard to that Power which it wants.

The two great Sanctions of all Law and Command are Rewards for Observance, and Punishments for Transgression. These are generally called the two Hinges, on which all Kinds of Government turn. And so far is certain and apparent to the common Sense of Mankind, that whatever Laws are not enforced by both these Sanctions, will never be observed in any degree sufficient to carry on the Ends of Society.

Yet,

Yet, I shall now shew, from the true and original Constitution of Civil Government, and from the Nature of Society, that the SANCTION OF REWARDS neither was, nor could be enforced by it, for the Observance of its Laws.

But for avoiding Mistakes, I desire it may be remarked, that by *Rewards*, must needs here be meant, *those which are conferred on every one for observing the Laws of his Country*; not those, which are bestowed on Particulars, for any eminent Service: as, by *Punishments*, we understand what is inflicted on every one for transgressing the Laws; not on Particulars, for neglecting to do all the Service in their power.

I make no doubt but this will be looked on as a violent Paradox; nothing being more common in the Mouths of Men, than that the Sanctions of Reward and Punishment are the two Pillars of Civil Government; and all the *Utopias*, and speculative Systems of Politics, both ancient and modern, deriving the whole Vigour of their Laws from these two Sources. I shall therefore beg leave to be something particular in the Proof of these two Propositions:

I. That *by the true, and original Constitution of Civil Government the Sanction of Rewards was not enforced*. In entering into Society, it was stipulated between the Governor and Governed, that *Protection* and *Obedience* should be the reciprocal Conditions of each other. When, therefore, a Citizen obeys the Laws, that Debt, on Society, is discharged by the Protection it affords him. But, in respect to Disobedience, the Proceeding is not analogous; though Protection, as the Condition of Obedience, implies the withdrawing of it, for Disobedience; — and for these Reasons: The Effect of withdrawing Protection must be either Ex-
pulsion

pulsion from the Society, or the exposing the Offender to all kind of Licence, from others, in it. Society could not practise the first, without bringing the Body Politic into a Consumption; nor the latter, without throwing it into Convulsions. Besides, the first is no Punishment at all, but by Accident; it being only the leaving one Society to enter into another: and the second is an inadequate Punishment: for though all Obedience is the same, and so, *uniform Protection* a proper Return for it; yet Transgressions being of various Kinds and Degrees, the withdrawing Protection would be too great a Punishment for some, and too small for others.

This being so, it was stipulated that the Violator of the Laws of the Society should be subject to pecuniary Mulcts, Mutilation of Members, corporal and capital Inflictions. Hence arose the Sanction, and only Sanction of Civil Laws: for that Protection is no Reward, in the Sense that these are Punishments, is plain from hence, that the one is of the Essence of Society itself, the other an adventitious Adjunct. But this will farther appear by considering the opposite to Protection, *Expulsion from the Society*, or Banishment: for this is the *natural* Consequence of withdrawing Protection. Now this, as we said, is no Punishment but by Accident: and so the State understood the Matter; as we may collect, even from their Manner of employing it *as a Punishment*, on Offenders: For Banishment is of universal Use, with other Punishments, in all Societies. Now where the thus withdrawing Protection is inflicted for Disobedience, all States have agreed, in Practice, to retain their Right to Obedience from the banished Member; though, according to the Nature of the Thing itself, that Right be really discharged: Obedience and Pro-

Protection, as we observed, being the reciprocal Conditions of each other. But it was necessary all States should act thus when they inflicted Exile as a Punishment; it being no Punishment, but by Accident, when the Claim to Subjection was remitted with it. — They had a *right* to act thus; because, being inflicted on an *Offender*, all Claim of Advantage, from that *reciprocal Condition*, had been before forfeited.¹

II. Our second Proposition is, *that the Sanction of Rewards could not, from the Nature of Society, be enforced by it*: The Reason is, because it could neither distinguish the Objects of its Favour, nor reward them, if distinguished.

I. First, *It could not distinguish the Objects of its Favour*. In inflicting Punishment, there is no need to know the Motives on which the Transgressor acted; but in judicially conferring Rewards, there is.

All that Civil Judicatures do, in Condemnation to Punishment, is to find out whether the Act was *voluntarily* committed. They inquire not into the Intention or Motives, any farther, or otherwise than as they are the Indications of *Volition*: and having found the Act *voluntary*, they concern themselves no more with his Motives or Principles of acting; but punish, without scruple, in confidence of the Offender's Demerit. And this with very

¹ This will lead us to determine an embarrassed Question long agitated amongst the Discourers on the Law of Nature and Nations; namely, *whether a banished Man be a Subject of the State that expelled him?* *Hobbes* and *Pufendorf* holding the negative; and *Tully*, and that best of Men, of Patriots, and of Writers, the Lord Chancellor, *Hyde*, the affirmative. The former give this in Support of their Opinion, that by the very Act of Expulsion, the State gives up and disclaims all Right of Subjection: the latter only appeal to the Practice of Societies; the Reason of which, given above, absolutely determines the Question in their favour.

good Reason ; because no one in his Senses can be ignorant of the principal Transgressions of Civil Laws, or of their Malignity, but by some sottish Negligence that has hindered his Information, or some brutal Passion that has prejudiced his Judgment : both which are highly faulty.

It is otherwise, in rewarding the abstaining from Transgression. Here the *Motive* must be considered : because as *merely doing Ill* deserves Punishment, a Crime in the Case of wrong Judgment being ever necessarily inferred ; so *merely abstaining from Ill* cannot for that very Reason have any Merit.

In judicially rewarding, the *Motives*, then, must be known : but human Judicatures can never come to the Knowledge of these, but by accident : it is only that Tribunal, which searches the Mind and the Heart, that can do this. Therefore we conclude, that Rewards cannot, properly, be the Sanction of human Laws.

If it should be said, that though Rewards cannot be equitably administred, as Punishments may, yet, what hinders, but that, for the Good of Society, all who observe the Laws should be rewarded, as all who transgress them are punished ? The Answer will lead us to the Proof of our second Point.

2. That *Society could not reward, when it had discovered the Objects of its Favour* ; because no Society could ever find a Fund sufficient for that purpose, without raising it on the People as a Tax, to pay it back to them, as a Reward.

But the universal Practice of Society confirms our Reasoning, and is explained by it : where the sole Sanction of *Punishments* have, in all Ages and Places, been employed by the State to secure the Observance of Civil Laws. This was so remarkable, as well as certain a Fact, that it could not escape

escape the Notice of a certain incomparable Wit, and acute Observer of Men and Manners: who, speaks of it, as an universal Defect, in these Words: *Although we usually call Reward and Punishment the two Hinges, upon which all Government turns, yet I could never observe this Maxim to be put in practice by any Nation except that of Lilliput^m.* Thus he introduces an Account of the Laws and Customs of an *Utopian* Constitution of his own framing; and, for that matter, perhaps, as good as any of the rest: and, had he intended it as a Satire against such Chimerical Commonwealths, nothing could have been more just. For all these political Romancers, from *Plato* to this Author, make Civil Rewards and Punishments *the two Hinges of Government.*

I have often wondered what it was, that should lead them from Fact, and universal Practice, in so fundamental a Circumstance of Civil Society. But doubtless it was this: — The Design of such sort of Writings is to give a perfect Pattern of Civil Government; and to supply the fancied Defects in actual Societies. The End of Civil Policy coming first under Consideration; and the general Practice of Society seeming to declare this End to be only, what it really is, *Security to the temporal Liberty and Property of Man*; the Simplicity of it displeased, and appeared defective. They imagined, that, by enlarging the Bottom, they should enoble the Plan; and, therefore, formed a romantick Project of making it serve for all the good Purposes it was even accidentally capable of producing. And thus, instead of giving us a true Picture of Government, they have jumbled together all sorts of Societies into one; and confounded the *Religious*, the *Lite-*

^m *Gulliver's Travels*, vol. i. p. 97.

rary, the *Mercantile*, the *Convivial*, with the *Civil*. Whoever reads them carefully, if indeed they be worth reading carefully, will find that the Errors they abound in are all of this Nature; and that they arise from the losing, or never having had, a true Idea of the simple Plan of Civil Society: a Circumstance, which, as we have shewn elsewhere, hath occasioned many wrong Judgments concerning Civil Society. It was no wonder then that this Mistake, concerning the *End* of Civil Society, should draw after it others, concerning the *Means*; and this amongst the rest, that *Reward* was one of the *Sanctions of human Laws*.

On the whole then, it appears, that Civil Society has not, in itself, the *Sanction of Rewards*, to secure the Observance of its Laws. So true, in this Sense, is it, what *St. Paul* divinely observes, that THE LAW WAS NOT MADE FOR THE RIGHTEOUS, BUT FOR THE UNRULY AND DISOBEDIENT.

But it being evident that the joint Sanctions of Rewards and Punishments are but just sufficient to secure the tolerable Observance of Right (the common false Opinion that these are the two Hinges of Government arising from that Evidence) it follows, that, as Religion, only, can supply the Sanction of Rewards, which Society wants, and has not, Religion is absolutely necessary to Civil Government.

Thus, on the whole, we see, that Society, by its own proper Force, cannot provide for the Observance of above one third Part of moral Duties; and of that third, by its not having the Sanction of Rewards, and for other Causes mentioned above, but imperfectly. We see likewise, how, by the peculiar Influence of its Nature, it enlarges the

Duty of the Citizen, at the same time that it lessens his natural Ability of performing.

To supply these Defects, in Civil Laws, some other coactive Power must be added, that hath its Influence on the Mind of Man; to keep Society from running back into Confusion. But there is no other than the Power of RELIGION; which teaching an over-ruling Providence, the Rewarder of good Men and the Punisher of ill, can oblige to the Duties of *imperfect Obligation*, which human Laws overlook; and teaching, also, that this Providence is omniscient, that it sees the most secret Actions and Intentions of Men, and hath given Laws for the perfecting their Nature, will oblige to those Duties of *perfect Obligation*, which human Laws cannot reach, or sufficiently enforce.

Thus we have explained, in general, the mutual Aid, *Religion* and *Civil Policy* lend to one another; not unlike that which two Allies, in the same Quarrel, may reciprocally receive against a common Enemy: While one Party is closely pressed, the other comes up to its Relief; disengages the first; gives it time to rally, and recruit its Powers: By this time the assisting Party is pushed in its turn, and needs the Aid of that which it relieved; which is now at hand to repay the Obligation. From henceforth, the two Parties ever act in Conjunction; and, by that means, keep the common Enemy at a stand.

Having thus proved the Service of Religion in general, to Society; and shewn by what Influence it is that this Service is performed, we are enabled to proceed to the Proof of the particular Proposition in question: For by what hath been said, it appears that this Service is performed by Religion, solely, as it teaches a Providence, the Rewarder of good Men, and the Punisher of Ill: So that, though

it were possible, as I think it is notⁿ, that there could be any such Thing as a Religion not founded on the Doctrine of a Providence; yet, it is evident, such a Religion could be of no manner of Service to Society. Whatsoever therefore is necessary for the Support of this Doctrine is mediately necessary for the Well-being of Society. That the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments is absolutely and indispensibly necessary for the Support of the general Doctrine of Providence, we shall now shew.

Religion establishing a Providence, the Rewarder of Virtue, and the Punisher of Vice, Men naturally expect to find the constant and invariable Marks of its Superintendency. But the History of Mankind, nay even of every one's own Neighbourhood, would soon inform the most indiligent Observer, that the Affairs of Men wear a Form of great Irregularity: the Scene, that ever and anon presents itself, being of distressed Virtue and prosperous Wickedness; which unavoidably brings the embarrassed Religionist to the necessity of giving up his Belief, or finding out the Solution of these untoward Appearances. His first Reflexion may perhaps be with the Poet^o:

Omnia rebar

*Consilio firmata Dei; qui lege moveri
Sidera, qui fruges diverso tempore nasci,
— Sed cum res hominum tanta caligine volvi
Adspicerem, lætosque diu florere nocentes,
Vexarique pios; rursus labefacta CADEBAT
RELLIGIO.*

ⁿ St. Paul supposes there can no more be a Religion without a Providence, than without a God. — *He (saith he) that cometh to God, must believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek him.*

^o Claud.

But

But on second Thoughts, Reason, that taught him, from the admirable Frame and Harmony of the material Universe, that there must needs be a superintending Providence, to influence that Order which all its Parts preserve in their continued Revolutions, would soon instruct him in the Absurdity of supposing the same Care did not extend to Man, a Creature of a far nobler Nature than the most considerable of inanimate Beings. And therefore human Affairs not being dispensed, at present, agreeably to that Superintendence, he must conclude, that Man shall exist after Death, to be brought to a future Reckoning in another Life, where all Accounts will be set even, and all the present Obscurities and Perplexities in the Ways of Providence unfolded and explained. From hence Religion acquires irresistible Force and Splendor; and rises on a solid and unshaken Basis. Hear an unexceptionable Evidence to this whole Matter. *Et quidem* (says the Free-thinking Lord Herbert) *præmium bonis, & supplicium malis, vel hac in vita, vel post hanc vitam dari, statuebant Gentiles. — Nihil magis congruum Naturæ divinæ esse docuerant, tum Philosophorum, tum Theologorum Gentilium præcipuorum Scholæ, quam ut bona bonis, mala malis remitteretur Deus. Cæterum quum id quoque cernerent, quemadmodum viri boni calamitatibus miserisque oppressi heic jacerent; mali improbique e contra lautitiis omnibus affluerent; certissimis ex justitia bonitateque divina argumentis deductis, bonis post hanc vitam præmium condignum, malis pœnam dari credebant: SECUS ENIM SI ESSET, NULLAM NEQUE JUSTITIÆ NEQUE BONITATIS DIVINÆ RATIONEM CONSTATARE POSSE^P.*

Now this Doctrine of a future State being the

^P *De Religione Gentilium, cap. Præmium vel Pœna.*

only Support of Religion, we conclude, which was what we had to prove, that the *inculcating it is necessary to the well being of Society.*

That this was the general Sentiment of Mankind, we shall see hereafter ; when it will be shewn, that, throughout the whole World there never was known, at any time, a civilized People (except the *Jewish*) who did not found their Religion on this Doctrine, as being conscious it could not be sustained without it. And as for the Necessity of Religion itself to Society, the very Enemies of all Religion are the loudest to confess it: For, from this most apparent Truth, the Atheist of old formed his famous Argument against the divine Original of Religion ; which makes so great a Figure in the common Systems of Infidelity. Here then we might rest our Cause, under the Support of our Adversary's Confession ; but that we find, so inconsistent and perverse is Irreligion, that some modern Apologists for Atheism have abandoned the System of their Predecessors, and chose rather to give up an Argument against the divine Original of Religion, than acknowledge the human Use of it. Which with much Frankness and Confidence they have thought fit to deny.

Now as *These* endeavour to overthrow the very Foundation of our Proof of the Proposition in question, it will be proper to examine their Pretences,

SECT. III.

THE three great Advocates for this Paradox are commonly reckoned *Pomponatius*, *Cardan*, and *Bayle* ; who are put together, without distinction, as the equal Maintainers of it : whereas nothing is more certain than that, although *Cardan* and *Bayle* indeed defended it, *Pomponatius* was of a quite different

different Opinion : but *Bayle* had entered him into this Service ; and so great is *Bayle's* Authority, that no body perceived he was pressed into it. It will be but Justice then to give *Pomponatius* a fair hearing, and let him speak for himself.

This learned *Italian*, a famous Peripatetic of the XVth Century, wrote a Treatise^a to prove that, on the Principles of *Aristotle*, it could not be demonstrated that the Soul was immortal : But the Doctrine of the Mortality of the Soul being generally thought to be attended with very pernicious Consequences, he conceived it lay upon him to say something to that Objection. In his 13th Chap. therefore, he enumerates those Consequences ; and in the 14th, gives distinct Answers to each of them. That which supposeth his Doctrine to affect Society, is expressed in these Words : —

“ *Obj. 2.* In the second Place, a Man persuaded of
 “ the Mortality of the Soul ought in no case, even
 “ in the most urgent, to prefer Death to Life :
 “ And so, Fortitude, which teaches us to despise
 “ Death, and, when our Country, or the Public
 “ Good requires, even to chuse it, would be no
 “ more. Nor on such Principles should we ha-
 “ zard Life for a Friend : on the contrary, we
 “ should commit any Wickedness rather than un-
 “ dergo the Loss of it : which is contrary to what
 “ *Aristotle* teaches in his *Ethics*.” His Reply to
 this, in the following Chapter, is that *Virtue re-*
quires we should die for our Country or our Friends ;

^a *De Immortalitate Animæ*, printed in 12^o An. 1534.

^r Secundo, quia itante animi humani mortalitate, homo in nullo casu, quantumcunque urgentissimo, deberet eligere mortem : & sic removeretur fortitudo, quæ præcipit contemnere mortem, & quod pro patria & bono publico debemus mortem eligere : neque pro amico deberemus exponere animam nostram ; imo quodcunque scelus & nefas perpetrare magisque mortem subire : quod est contra *Arist.* 3 *Ethic.* & 9 ejusdem, p. 99.

and that *Virtue is never so perfect as when it brings no Dower with it*: But then subjoins, “Philosophers, and the Learned, only know what Pleasures the Practice of Virtue can procure; and what Misery attends Ignorance and Vice: — but Men not understanding the Excellence of Virtue, and Deformity of Vice, would commit any Wickedness rather than submit to Death: to bridle therefore their unruly Apperites, they were taught to be influenced by Hope of Reward, and Fear of Punishment^f.” This is enough to shew what *Pomponatius* thought of the Necessity of Religion to the State. He gives up so much of the Objection as urges the ill consequence of the Doctrine of the Mortality on Mankind in general; but in so doing doth not betray the Cause he undertakes: which was, to prove that the Belief of the Mortality of the Soul would have no ill Influence on the Practice of a learned Peripatetic: not that it would not have it on the gross body of Mankind, to the prejudice of Society. This appears from the Nature and Design of the Treatise; wrote entirely on Peripatetic Principles, to explain a Point in that Philosophy: by which Explanation, whoever was persuaded of the Mortality of the Soul, must give his Assent on those Principles; but those were only fitted for learned Men. It was his Business therefore to examine, what Effects this Belief would have on such, and on such only. And this, it must be owned, he hath done with Dexterity enough. But that this Belief would be most

^f Soli enim philosophi & studiosi, ut dicit Arist. 6 Ethic. sciunt quantum delectationem generent virtutes, & quantum miseriam ignorantia & vitia. — Sed quod homines non cognoscentes excellentiam virtutis & seditatem vitii, omne scelus perpetrarent, primumquam mori: quare ad refrænandum diras hominum cupiditates, data est spes præmii & timor punitionis. p. 119.

pernicious to the general Body of Mankind, he confesses with the utmost Ingenuity. And as his own Words are the fullest Proof imaginable that he thought with the rest of the World, concerning the Influence of Religion, and particularly of the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, on Society, I shall beg leave to transcribe them at length. — “ There are some Men of so
 “ ingenuous and well framed a Nature, that they
 “ are brought to the Practice of Virtue from the
 “ the sole Consideration of its Dignity ; and are
 “ kept from Vice on the bare Prospect of its Baseness : But such excellent Persons are very rare.
 “ Others there are of a somewhat less heroic Turn
 “ of Mind ; and these, besides the Dignity of
 “ Virtue, and Baseness of Vice, are worked upon
 “ by Fame and Honours, by Infamy and Disgrace,
 “ to shun Evil, and persevere in Good : These
 “ are of the second Class of Men. Others again
 “ are kept in order by the Hope of some real Benefit, or the Dread of corporal Punishment ;
 “ wherefore that such may follow Virtue, the Politician hath allured them by Dignities, Possessions, and Things of the like Nature ; and hath
 “ inflicted Mulcts, Degradations, Mutilations, and
 “ capital Punishments, to deter them from Wickedness. There are yet others of so intractable
 “ and perverse a Spirit, that nothing of this can
 “ move them, as daily Experience shews us ; for
 “ these, therefore, it was, that the Politician contrived *the Doctrine of a future State* ; where eternal Rewards are reserved for the virtuous, and
 “ eternal Punishments, which have the more powerful Influence of the two, for the Wicked. For
 “ the greater part of those who live well, do so,
 “ rather for Fear of the Punishment than out of
 “ Appetite to the Reward : For Misery is better

“ known

“ known to Man, than that immeasurable Good
 “ which Religion promises: and therefore as this
 “ Temper of Humanity may be directed to pro-
 “ mote the Welfare of Men of all Conditions and
 “ Degrees, the Legislator, who, while he was in-
 “ tending a common good, saw a general Propen-
 “ sity to Evil, gave his Sanction to the Doctrine
 “ of the Immortality of the Soul. In pursuing
 “ which Intention, he was not anxious in follow-
 “ ing Truth, so he could but light upon Utili-
 “ ty, or the Means of drawing Men to Virtue.
 “ Nor is he to be blamed: For as the Physician
 “ deludes his Patient in order to restore his Health,
 “ so the Lawgiver invents Apologues to form the
 “ Manners of his People. Indeed were all of
 “ that noble Turn of Mind with those enumerated
 “ under the first Class, then would they all, even
 “ though the established Doctrine was the Morta-
 “ lity of the Soul, exactly perform to one another
 “ the Duties and Devoirs of Citizens. *But as*
 “ *there are, upon the matter, none of this Disposition,*
 “ he must, of necessity, work Men as he found
 “ them, &c.”

After

“ Aliqui sunt homines ingenui, & bene institutæ naturæ, adeo
 quod ad virtutem inducuntur ex sola virtutis nobilitate, & a vitio
 retrahuntur ex sola ejus scditate: & hi optimè dispositi sunt. Ali-
 qui vero sunt minus bene dispositi; & hi præter nobilitatem virtu-
 tis, & scdritatem vitii, ex præmiis, laudibus, & honoribus; ex
 pœnis, vituperiis, & infamia studiosa operantur, & vitia fugiunt:
 & hi in secundo gradu sunt. Aliqui vero propter spem alicujus
 boni, & timorem pœnæ corporalis studiosi efficiuntur; quare ut
 tales virtutem consequantur, statuunt politici vel auram, vel digni-
 tatem, vel aliquid tale, ut vitia vero fugiant; statuunt vel in pec-
 unia, vel in honore, vel in corpore, seu mutilando membrum,
 seu occidendo puniri. Quidam vero ex ferocitate & perversitate
 nature nullo horum moventur, ut quotidiana docet experientia;
 ideo potuerunt virtuosus in alia vita præmia æterna, vitiosis vero
 æterna damna, quæ maximè terrerent: majorque pars hominum,
 à bonum operatur, magis ex metu æterni damni quam spe æterni
 boni

After all this, it is strangely surprizing that Mr. Bayle should so far mistake this Book as to imagine the Author argues in it *against the Usefulness of Religion to Society*: especially, when we consider, that Mr. Bayle appears to have examined the Book so nearly as to be able to confute a common Error concerning it, namely, *that it was wrote to prove the Mortality of the Soul*: whereas he shews, that it was wrote only to prove, that, on the Principles of *Aristotle*, neither that nor the contrary could be demonstrated. — But let us hear him: “Ce que
 “Pomponace a repondu à la raison empruntée de
 “ce, que le dogme de la mortalité de l’ame por-
 “teroit les hommes à toutes fortes de crimes est
 “digne de consideration.” And then he produces those Arguments of *Pomponatius*, which we have given above, *of the natural Excellence of Virtue, and Deformity of Vice*; that *Happiness consists in the Practice of the one, and Misery in that of the other, &c.* These he calls *poor Solutions*: And, indeed, that would be too soft a Name for them, was *Pomponatius*, as Mr. Bayle supposes, designing to prove that the Doctrine of the *Mortality* of the Soul did not invite the generality of Men to all sort of Wickedness: for the Account given by *Pomponatius* himself of the Origin of the Doctrine of the *Immortality*,

boni operatur bonum, cum damna sint magis nobis cognita quam illa bona æterna: & quoniam hoc ultimum ingenium omnibus hominibus potest prodesse, cujuscunque gradus sint, respiciens Legislator pronitatem viarum ad malum, intendens communi bono, sanxit animam esse immortalem, non curans de veritate, sed tantum de probitate, ut inducat homines ad virtutem. Neque accusandus est politicus: sicut namque medicus multa fingit, ut a gro sanitatem restituat; sic politicus Apologos format, ut cives rectificent. — Si omnes homines essent in illo primo gradu enumerato, stante etiam animorum mortalitate, studiosi fierent; sed quasi nulli sunt illius dispositionis, quare aliis ingeniis incedere necesse fuit,

— pag. 123 124, 125.

“ Dict. Hist. & Crit. Art. (Pomponace) Rem. (H.)

shews,

shews, that, but for it, they would have run headlong into Vice. But supposing this Peripatetic's Design to be, as indeed it was, to prove that the Belief of the *Mortality* would have no ill Influence on the learned Followers of *Aristotle*, then these Arguments, which Mr. *Bayle* calls *poor ones*, will be found to have their Weight. But he goes on, and says, that *Pomponatius* brings a better Argument from Fact, where he takes notice of several who denied the Immortality of the Soul, and yet lived as well as their believing Neighbours. This is indeed a good Argument to the purpose, for which it is employed by *Pomponatius*; but whether it be so to that, for which, Mr. *Bayle* imagined, he employed it, shall be considered hereafter, when we come to meet with it amongst this Writer's Reasonings, who hath transferred it into his Apology for Atheism. But Mr. *Bayle* was so full of his own favourite Question, that he did not give a due Attention to *Pomponatius's*; and having, as I observed above, refuted a vulgar Error with regard to this famous Tract, and imagining that the Impiety, so generally charged on it, was solely founded in that Error, he goes on insulting the Enemies of *Pomponatius* thus: “ Si
 “ l'on n'a fondé les impietez, dont on l'accuse,
 “ que sur son livre de l'immortalité de l'ame, il n'y
 “ eut jamais de accusation plus impertinente que
 “ celle-la, ni qui soit une marque plus expresse de
 “ l'entetement inique des persecuteurs des Philoso-
 “ phes.” But *Pomponatius* won't be so easily set clear: For let him think as he would concerning the Soul, yet the Account he gives of the Origin of Religion, as the Contrivance of Statesmen, produced above in his own Words, from this very Tract de *Immortalitate Animæ*, is so highly impious, that his Enemies will scarce be persuaded to give it a softer Name than downright Atheism. Nor is
 it

it Impiety in the general, that we endeavour to acquit him of, in these Remarks, but only of that Species of it, which teaches *Religion to be useless to Society*. And this we think we have done; although it be by shewing him to have run into the opposite Extream, which pretends *Religion to be the Creature of Politicks*.

Cardan comes next to be considered: and him no one hath injured. He too is under the same Delusion with *Bayle* concerning *Pomponatius*: For writing on the same Subject^w, he borrows the *Peripatetic's* Arguments to prove that *Religion was even prejudicial to Society*. This was so bold a Stroke, that *Mr. Bayle*, who generally follows him pretty closely, drops him here: Nor do I know that he ever had a second, except it was the unhappy Philosopher of *Malmfbury*; who scorning, in his dogmatic way, to argue upon the Matter, imperiously pronounced, that he who presumed to propagate Religion in a Society, was guilty of the Crime of *Lese Majesty*, as introducing a Power superior to the *Leviathan's*. But it would be unpardonable to keep the Reader much longer on this poor lunatic *Italian*, in whom, as *Mr. Bayle* pleasantly observes, *Sense was, at best, but an Appendix to his Folly*^x. Besides, there is little in that Tract, but

^w *De Immortalitate Animorum liber*, Lugd. ap. Gryph. 1545.

^x The charming Picture he draws of himself, and which he excuses no otherwise than by laying the Fault on his Stars. will hardly prejudice any one in favour of his Opinions. How far it resembles any other of the Brotherhood, they best know, who have examined the Genius of modern Infidelity. However, thus he speaks of his own amiable Turn of Mind. — “In diem viventem, nugacem, religionis contemptorem, injuriæ illatæ memorem, invidum, tristem, insidiatorem, proditorem, magum, incantatorem, suorum osorem, turpi libidini deditum, solitari-um, inamœnum, austerum; sponte etiam divinantem, zelotypum, obscœnum, lascivum, maledicum, varium, ancipitem, impurum,

but what he stole from *Pomponatius*, the Conclusiveness of which, to *Cardan's* Paradox, hath been already considered; or what Mr. *Bayle* hath borrowed from him, the Force of which shall be examined hereafter. But that little is so peculiarly his own, that as no other can claim a Share in the Property, so no one hitherto hath usurped the Use. Which in truth tho' is remarkable: for there is no Trash so worthless, but what one time or other finds a Place in a Free-thinker's System. We will not then despair but that this poor contemptible Rubbish may one day have an honourable Station in some of these fashionable Fabricks. And, not to hinder its speedy Advancement, we will here present it to the Reader, in its full Force, without Answer or Observation. He brings the following Argument to prove that the Doctrine of the *Immortality* of the Soul is destructive to Society: — “ From this flattering Notion of a Future State
 “ ill Men get opportunity to compass their wicked
 “ Schemes: and, on the same account, good Men
 “ suffer themselves to be injuriously treated. Civil
 “ Laws, relying on this fanciful Assistance, relax
 “ their necessary Severity: And thus is the Op-
 “ nion productive of much Mischief to Mankind.” And then, by another Argument as good, he shews the Benefits accruing to the State from the Belief of the Soul's *Mortality*: — “ Those who maintain
 “ that the Soul dies with the Body, must needs be,
 “ by their Principles, honefter Men than others,

“ *impurum, calumniatorem,*” &c. We have had many *Free-thinkers*, but few such *Free-speakers*. But though these sort of Writers are not used to give us so direct a Picture of themselves, yet it has been observed, that they have unawares copied from their own Natures, in the ungracious Drawings they have made of HUMAN NATURE and RELIGION.

De Immortalitate Animarum, Cap. 2.

“ because

“ because they have a peculiar Interest in preserv-
 “ ing their Reputation ; that being the only future
 “ property they pretend to : And this Profession
 “ being generally esteemed as scandalous as that
 “ of Usury, such Men will be most exact and scru-
 “ pulous in point of Honour, as your Usurer, to
 “ keep up the Credit of his Calling, is, of all Men,
 “ the most religious Observer of his Word^z.”

S E C T. IV.

MR. BAYLE, the last Espouser of this Paradox, is of a quite different Character from these *Italian* Sophists: A Writer whose Strength and Clearness of Reasoning, can be equalled only by the Gaiety, Easiness, and Delicacy of his *Wit*: Who, pervading human Nature with a Glance, struck into the Province of *Paradox*, as an Exercise for the restless Vigour of his Mind: Who, with a Soul superior to the sharpest Attacks of Fortune, and a Heart practised to the best Philosophy, had not yet enough of real Greatness to overcome that last Foible of superior Geniuses, the Temptation of Honour, which the *Academic Exercise of Wit* is supposed to bring to its Professors.

A Writer of this Character will deserve a very particular Regard: For *Paradoxes*, in such hands, will always be productive of something for Use or Curiosity (as in this very Work we are about to examine^a, the many admirable Observations on the Nature and Genius of ancient Polytheism, happen to be the strongest Confutation imaginable of all

^z Cap. 33. ej. tr.

^a Pensées diverses, écrites à un Docteur de Sorbonne à l'occasion de la Comète qui parut au Mois de Decembre, 1680. & — Continuation des Pensées diverses, &c. ou Réponse à plusieurs difficultez, &c.

the Author of *Christianity as old as the Creation* hath advanced against the Use and Necessity of Revelation) which, under the Management of a *Toland* or a *Collins*, subside into rank offensive Impiety: As a skilful Chymist, though disappointed in the vain Pursuit of his *grand Magisterium*, yet often discovers, by the way, some useful and noble Medicament; while the ignorant Pretender, in the same Enquiry, not only loses his Labour, but fills all about him with the poisonous Steams of *Sublime*, which he knew not how to manage or subdue.

The *professed* Design of Mr. Bayle's Work is to inquire, *which is least hurtful to Mankind, Ancient Idolatry or Modern Atheism*: And had he confined himself to that Subject, we had had no Concern with him, but had left him in the Hands of Mess. *Jacquelot* and *Bernard*. I freely own they are both stark naught: All the Difference is, that Atheism directly excludes and destroys the *true* Sense of moral Right and Wrong; and Polytheism sets up a *false* Species of it.

But the more particular, though less avowed, Purpose of this elaborate Treatise is to prove, that *Atheism is not destructive of Society*; and here he falls under our Notice; no distinct Answer, that I know of, having been yet attempted to this Part of his Performance.

His Arguments are occasionally and confusedly interspersed throughout that large Work: But, to give them the utmost Advantage of Representation, I have here collected and digested them in such Order, that they mutually support and come in to the Aid of one another.

It had been generally esteemed an evident Proof of the Destructiveness of Atheism to Society, that *that Principle excludes the Knowledge of moral Good*
and

and Evil : such Knowledge being posterior to the Knowledge of a God. His first Argument therefore for the *Innocence of Atheism* is,

I. “ That an Atheist may have an Idea of the
 “ moral Difference between Good and Ill, because
 “ Atheists as well as Theists may comprehend the
 “ first Principles of Morals and Metaphysics, from
 “ which this Difference may be deduced. And
 “ in fact (he says) both the *Epicurean* Atheist, who
 “ denied the Providence of God, and the *Stratonic*
 “ Atheist, who denied his being, had this Idea^b. ”

This often repeated Argument is so loosely expressed that it is capable of many Meanings ; in some of which the Assertion is true, but not to the purpose ; in others, to the purpose, but not true. Therefore before any precise Answer can be given to it, it will be necessary to trace up Moral Duty to its first Principles. And though this Sort of Abstraction should not prove the most entertaining Amusement either to myself or Reader, by reason of the strange Confusion that a Spirit of Dispute and Refinement hath thrown over a thing of itself very clear and intelligible, a Confusion so great, that was *Morality* herself, of which the *Ancients* made a Goddess, to appear personally, and be questioned concerning her Birth, I am persuaded, she would be tempted to answer as *Homer* does in *Lucian*, that her Commentators had so entangled and embarrassed the Dispute, that she was now as much at a loss as they to account for her Original : Though this Subject, I say, be not the most entertaining, it may be found to reward both our Labours.

^b Voyez les Pensées diverses, cap. 178. & suiv. & l'addition à ces Pensées, cap. 4. Réponse à la 10 & à la 13 Cojections, & la Continuation des Pens. div. cap. 143.

To proceed with all possible Brevity -- Each Animal has its *instinct* implanted by Nature to direct him to his greatest Good. Amongst these, Man hath his ; to which modern Philosophers have given the Name of

1. The *Moral Sense* : An *instinctive* Approbation of *Right* and Abhorrence of *Wrong*, prior to all Reflexion on their Nature, or their Consequences. This is the first Inlet to the *adequate Idea of Morality* ; and, plainly, the most extensive of all ; the Atheist as well as Theist having it. When Instinct had gone thus far,

2. The *Reasoning Faculty* improved upon its Dictates : For, reflecting Men, naturally led to examine the Foundation of Reason, in this *moral sense*, soon discovered that there were real essential Differences in the Qualities of human Actions, established by Nature ; and, consequently, that the Love and Hatred excited by the *Moral Sense* were not capricious in their Operations ; for, that the essential Properties of their Objects had a specific Difference. Reason having gone thus far, and thus far too it might conduct the Stratonian Atheist, it stopped ; and saw that to establish the *Morality*, properly so called, of Actions, that is, an *Obligation* or *Injunction*, on Men, to perform some and to avoid others, there was need of calling in other Principles to its Assistance : For nothing can thus oblige but

3. A *Superior Will* : And such a *Will* could not be found 'till the Being and Attributes of God were established, but was discovered with them.

Hence arose, and only from hence, a MORAL DIFFERENCE. From this time human Actions became the Subject of Obligation, and not 'till now : For though INSTINCT discovered a Difference in Actions ; and REASON proved *that* Difference

ference to be founded in the Nature of Things ; yet it was WILL only that could make a Compliance with that Difference, a DUTY.

On these Principles then, namely *the Moral Sense*, — *the Essential Difference in Human Actions*, — and the *Will of God*, is built the whole Edifice of *Practical Morality* : Each of which Principles hath its distinct Motive to inforce it ; Compliance with the *Moral Sense* being attended with a grateful Sensation ; Compliance with the *essential Differences of Things* being the promoting the Order and Harmony of the Universe ; and Compliance with the *Will of God*, the obtaining Reward and avoiding Punishment.

This, when attentively considered, cannot fail of affecting every one with the most lively Sense of the Goodness of God to Mankind : who, graciously respecting the Imperfections of Man's Nature, the Weakness of his Reason, and the Violence of his Passions, hath been pleased to give three different Excitements to the Practice of Virtue : that Men of all Ranks, Constitutions, and Educations, might find their account in one or other of them ; something that would hit their *Palate*, satisfy their *Reason*, or subdue their *Will*. The first Principle, which is the *Moral Sense*, would strongly operate on those, who by the exact Temperature and Balance of the Passions, were disengaged enough to feel the Delicacy and Grandeur of the Moral Sense ; and had an Elegance of Mind to be charmed with the Nobleness of its Dictates. The second, which is *the Essential Difference* founded in the natural Relations of Things, will have its Weight with the Speculative, the abstracted and profound Reasoners, and on all those who excel in the Knowledge of Mankind. And the third, which resolves itself into the *Will of God*, and

takes in all the Consequences of Obedience and Disobedience, is principally adapted to the common Run o' Men.

It may perhaps be objected, to what is here delivered, *That the true Principle of Morality should have the worthiest Motive to enforce it: whereas the Will of God, which we make that Principle, is enforced by the View of Rewards and Punishments; on which Motive, Virtue hath the smallest Merit.* This Character of the true Principle of Morality, that it ought to have the worthiest Motive to enforce it, is perfectly right; and agrees, we say, with the Principle which we make to be so: For the legitimate Motive to Virtue, on that Principle, is *Compliance with the Will of God*; which hath the highest degree of Merit. But this not being found of Force sufficient to take in the generality, the Consequences of Compliance or Non-Compliance to this Will, as far as relates to Rewards and Punishments, were first drawn out to the People's View. In which they were dealt with just as the Teachers of Mathematics treat their Pupils; when, to engage them in a sublime Demonstration, they explain to them the Utility of the Theorem.

To these great Purposes do the three Principles serve, while in Conjunction: But now, as in the Moral World and the Affairs of Men, our Pleasure, in contemplating the Wisdom and Goodness of Providence, is often disturbed and checked by the View of some human Perversity or Folly which runs cross that Dispensation; so it is here, in the *Intellectual*. This admirable Provision for the Support of Virtue hath been, in great measure, defeated by its pretended Advocates; who, in their eternal Squabbles about the true Foundation of Morality, and the Obligation to its Practice, have sacrilegiously untwisted this *threefold Cord*; and each

each running away with the Part he esteemed the strongest, hath affixed that to the Throne of Heaven, as the Golden Chain that is to unite and draw all to it.

This Man proposes to illustrate the Doctrine of the *Moral Sense*; and then the Morality of Actions is founded only in that *Sense*: With him, Metaphysics and Logic, by which the *Essential Difference*, in human Actions, is demonstrated, are nothing but *Words, Notions, Visions*; *the empty Regions and Shadows of Philosophy*. The Professors of them are *Moon-blind Wits*; and Locke himself is treated as a School-man. To talk of Reward and Punishment, consequent on the *Will of a Superior*, is the Way to make the Practice of Virtue mercenary and servile: from which, pure human Nature is the most abhorrent.

Another undertakes to demonstrate *the Essential Difference of Things*, and their natural Fitness and Unfitness to certain Ends: And then *Morality* is solely founded on those Differences; and God and his Will have nothing to do in the Matter. Then the Will of God cannot make any Thing morally good and evil, just and unjust; nor consequently be the Cause of any Obligation on Moral Agents: because the Essences and Natures of Things, which constitute Actions good and evil, are independent of that Will; which is forced to submit to their Relations like weak Man's. And therefore, if there was no natural Justice, that is, if the rational and intellectual Nature was, of itself, undetermined and unobliged to any thing, and so destitute of Morality, it was not possible that any thing should be made morally good or evil, obligatory or unlawful, or that any moral Obligation should be begotten, by any Will or positive Command whatsoever. And then our Knowledge of moral Good

and Evil is solely acquired by abstract Reasoning: and to talk of their coming any other way into the Mind, is weak and superstitious, as making God act unnecessarily and superfluously.

A Third, who proposes to place *Morality* on its true bottom, *the Will of a Superior*, acts yet on the same exterminating Model. He takes the other two Principles to be merely visionary: The *Moral Sense* is nothing but the Prejudice of Education; the Love of the Species, chimerical: The Notions were invented by crafty Knaves, to dupe the Young, the Vain, and Ambitious. Nature, he saith, hath confined us to the narrow Sphere of Self-love; and our most pompous Parades of pure Disinterestedness, but the more artful Disguises of that very Passion. He not only denies all *Moral Difference* in Actions, antecedent to the Will of God, which (as we shall shew anon) he might well do; but likewise, all *Specific Difference*: affirms that the *Notions* of fit and unfit proceed not from *this Difference*, but from the arbitrary Impositions of Will only; that God is the free Cause of Truths as well as Beings; and then, consequently, if he so wills, two and two would not make four.

Thus have Men, born away by a Fondness to their own fanciful Systems, presumptuously broken in upon that triple Barrier, with which God has been graciously pleased to cover and secure Virtue; and given Advantage to the Cavils of Libertines and Infidels; who, on each of these three Principles, thus advanced on the Ruins of the other two, have reciprocally forged a Scheme of Religion independent of Morality^c; and a Scheme of

^d See *the Fable of the Bees*, and confer the *Enquiry into the original of Moral Virtue*, and the *Search into the Nature of Society*, with the Body of the Book.

Morality independent of Religion^d; who, how different soever their Employments may seem, are indeed but twisting the same Rope at contrary Ends: the plain Design of both being to overthrow Religion. But as the Moralists's is the more plausible Scheme, it is become most in fashion: So that of late Years a Deluge of Moral Systems, in which either the *Moral Sense*, or the *Essential Difference* makes the sole Foundation, have overrun the learned World; that, like the Chorus of Clouds in *Aristophanes*, the Αἰνάοι Νεφέλαι, the ETERNAL RELATIONS, are introduced into the Scene, with a gaudy outside, to supplant *Jupiter*; and to teach the Arts of Fraud and Sophistry; but soon betray themselves to be empty, obscure, noisy, impious Nothings.

In a word to the several Sorts of *Separatists*, those I mean who are indeed Friends to Religion, and detest the Infidel's Abuse of their Principles, I would recommend the Interpretation of the following Oracle of an antient Sage^e. ΟΥ' ΓΑΡ 'ΕΣΤΙΝ 'ΕΥΡΕΙΝ ΤΗΣ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗΣ 'ΑΛΛΗΝ 'ΑΡΧΗΝ 'ΟΥΔΕ 'ΑΛΛΗΝ ΓΕΝΕΣΙΝ, 'Η ΤΗΝ 'ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΔΙΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΚΟΙΝΗΣ ΦΥΣΕΩΣ.

^d See the fourth Treatise of the *Characteristics*, intitled, *An Inquiry concerning Virtue and Merit*.

^e This noble Truth, that the only true Foundation and Original of Morality is the Will of God interpreted by the Moral Sense and Essential Difference of Things, was a random Thought of *Chrysippus* the Stoic. I say so, 1. Because the ancient Philosophy in general teaches nothing certain concerning the true Ground of Moral Obligation. 2. Because *Plutarch's* quoting it amongst the *Repugnances of the Stoics*, shews it to be inconsistent with their other Doctrine. And indeed, the following the antient Philosophers too servilely, has occasioned the Errors of modern Moralists, in unnaturally separating the Grounds of Obligation: *Plato* being the Patron of the *Moral Sense*; *Aristotle* of the *Essential Differences*; and the *Stoics* of *Arbitrary Will*. — How much the Ancients perceived themselves bewildered in this Search, and what Expedient they used to extricate themselves, will be seen hereafter.

And now, to come more directly to our Adversary's Argument: which this Preparation hath enabled us to answer clearly and distinctly. We say then,

1. That the Atheist cannot arrive to the Knowledge of the *Morality* of Actions, properly so called.
2. That though he be capable of being affected with the Moral Sense, and may arrive to the Knowledge of the Real Essential Differences in the Qualities of human Actions; yet this Sense, and this Knowledge, make nothing for the purpose of Mr. Bayle's Argument: because these, even in conjunction, are totally insufficient to influence Society, in the Practice of Virtue: which Influence is the Foundation of the Question.

Both these Conclusions, I presume, have been pretty clearly made out, by what hath been said above, of *the Origin of Society*, and, just before, of *the Foundation of Moral Virtue*: But that nothing may be wanting to the clearest Eviction, in these important Points, I shall crave leave to examine the Matter with a little more Precision.

1. And first, *that an Atheist, as such, can never arrive to the Knowledge of the Morality of Actions, properly so called*, we shall farther make good against the Force of Mr. Bayle's Arguments, which he brings to prove, *that the Morality of human Actions may be demonstrated on the Principles of a Stratonicean, or Atheistic Fatalist*; whom he personates in this manner: "The 'Beauty, Symmetry, Regularity, and Order, seen in the Universe, are

^f La beauté, la symétrie, la régularité, l'ordre que l'on voit dans l'univers, sont l'ouvrage d'un nature qui n'a point de connoissance, & qu'encore, &c. *Contin. des Pers. diverses*, c. 151.

“ the Effects of a blind unintelligent Nature ; and
 “ though this Nature, in her Workmanship, hath
 “ copied after no Ideas, she hath nevertheless pro-
 “ duced an infinite number of Species, with each
 “ its distinct essential Attribute. It is not in con-
 “ sequence of our Opinion, that Fire and Water
 “ differ in Species, and that there is a like Dif-
 “ ference between Love and Hatred, Affirmation
 “ and Negation. This specific Difference is found-
 “ ed in the Nature of the Things themselves. But
 “ how do we know this? Is it not by comparing
 “ the essential Properties of one of these Beings
 “ with the essential Properties of another of them?
 “ But we know, by the same way, that there is a
 “ specific Difference between Truth and Falshood,
 “ between good Faith and Perfidiousness, between
 “ Gratitude and Ingratitude, &c. We may then
 “ be assured, that Vice and Virtue differ specifi-
 “ cally, by their Nature, independent of our Opi-
 “ nion.” — This Mr. *Bayle* calls their being *natu-
 rally* separated from each other : And thus much
 we grant him. But he goes on : “ Let ^s us see
 “ now by what ways Stratonie Atheists may come
 “ to the Knowledge of Vice and Virtue’s being
 “ *morally* as well as *naturally* separated. They at-
 “ tribute to the same Necessity of Nature the Esta-
 “ blishment of those Relations which we find to be
 “ between Things, and the Establishment of those
 “ Rules by which we distinguish those Relations.
 “ There are Rules of Reasoning independent of
 “ the Will of Man : It is not because Men have
 “ been pleased to fix the Rules of Syllogism, that
 “ therefore those Rules are just and true : they are
 “ so in themselves, and all the Endeavours of the

§ Voions comment ils pouvoient savoir qu’elles estoient entre
 cela séparées moralement. Ils attribuoient, &c. *Idem ibid.*

“ Wit of Man against their Effence and their At-
 “ tributes would be ridiculous and in vain.” —
 This we likewise grant him. He proceeds: —
 “ If then there are certain and immutable Rules for
 “ the Operation of the Understanding, there are
 “ also such for the Determinations of the Will.” —
 This, now, we deny. He would prove it thus:
 — “ The^b Rules of these Determinations are not
 “ altogether arbitrary; some of them proceed from
 “ the Necessity of Nature; and these impose an
 “ indispensable Obligation. The most general of
 “ these Rules is this, *that Man ought to will what*
 “ *is most conformable to right Reason*: For there is
 “ no Truth more evident than this, that it is fit a
 “ reasonable Creature should conform to right Rea-
 “ son, and unfit that such a Creature should re-
 “ cede from it.” — This is his Argument, in which
 he gives us the most general Rule whereby his
 Stratonicean is directed to the Discovery of the
Moral Difference in Actions. To which we reply,
 1. That the Rule is quite obscure with regard to a
 Stratonicean, and so can serve for no Direction at
 all. 2. That was it as clear to *him* as to the Theist,
 it could neither serve *him* nor any one else in this
 Discovery.

1. The Rule is obscure and uncertain: For a
 Stratonicean, as such, can never know what is a-
 greeable or disagreeable to right Reason in the De-
 terminations of the Will, though he may in the
 Operations of the Understanding; because in the
 Operations of the Understanding there is nothing
 to be considered but that specific essential Difference
 of Things, and their Relations amongst one ano-
 ther, as they are in themselves. But in the Deter-

^b Les regles de ces actes — là ne sont pas toutes arbitraires:
 il y en a quelques-unes, &c. *Ibid.*

minations of the Will, this Difference of Things, and their Relations, not only as they are in themselves, but as they refer to the Determiner, are to be taken in and considered: And this latter set of Relations are, in common life, so opposite, generally, and contradictory to the former, that this *Rule of acting conformably to right Reason*, would be a very uncertain, if not useless Direction to him: For what would be according to right Reason in any Action were there only the essential Difference of Things themselves, and their Relations amongst one another, to be considered, may not be according to right Reason, on the Principles of a Stratonicean, when their Relations to the Considerer are taken in: And to reconcile these Contrarieties, there is need of another Principle, from whence may be deduced a Coincidence and Concomitancy, intentionally produced, between those jarring Relations; in order to determine steadily the Acts of the Will: which Coincidence, he who regards himself as the Effect of a fatal unintelligent Nature, is forced to deny. The acting therefore agreeably to right Reason, though it was a Rule to a Theist, could be none to him. This the Reader will perceive fully obviates the Argument Mr. Bayle brings to reduce his Adversaries to an Absurdity, in these Words: — “ Ifⁱ you object to me, that a Stratonie Atheist cannot know what is conformable to
 “ right Reason, in the Determinations of the Will,
 “ because he admits only a blind unintelligent Nature for the Principle of all things, your Objection will prove too much; it will prove, that
 “ a Stratonicean cannot know that it is against
 “ right Reason to make use of a Syllogism of four

ⁱ Si vous m'objectez qu'un Stratonicien ne peut pas connoître cela puis qu'il n'admet, &c. *Idem ibid.*

“Terms.” The Reason why in this latter Case he may know what is agreeable or disagreeable to right Reason, and why he cannot in the former, we have given just before.

If it should be said; and the Atheist is like enough to say it, because by right Reason he generally means his own: that, as the Acting according to Appearance, and the Degree of Light every one hath, is acting according to Reason. This Rule is no more obscure or uncertain to an Atheist than a Theist; if this, I say, should be said and allowed, thus much at least must be concluded, that the general Rule of *acting conformably to Right Reason* is not one and the same to the Atheist and Theist, but two very different Rules. From different Causes, different Effects must follow. If then the Theist, as Mr. Bayle confesses, may discover the moral Difference by his, it is Demonstration the Atheist cannot. And yet it is that very System of Morals which all Theists contend for, that Mr. Bayle would give his Atheist the Honour of the Discovery of.

2. But Secondly, Admit the Stratonian Atheist might know what was really agreeable to right Reason in the Acts of the Will. We then tell him that he could not from thence establish the *moral Difference*. He contends that *Things are both naturally and morally separable*. He speaks of these Ideas as very different (as indeed they are) and proves the Truth of them by different Arguments. *The natural essential Difference of things* then, if we mean any thing by the Terms, hath this apparent property; that it creates a *Fitness* in the Agent to act agreeably thereto: As the *Moral Difference* of things creates besides this *Fitness* an *Obligation* likewise; when therefore there is an *Obligation* in the Agent, there is a *Moral Difference* in the

the things, and so on the contrary, for they are inseparable. If then we prove that right Reason alone cannot properly oblige, it follows that the Knowledge of what is agreeable to right Reason doth not induce the Knowledge of a *Moral Difference*: Or that a Stratonicean is not under any Obligation; or, in Mr Bayle's Words, *ought* not to act agreeably to right Reason.

I. Obligation in general necessarily implies an Obliger: The Obliger must be different from, and not one and the same with the Obligated: To make the same Man at once the Obliger and Obligated, is the same thing as to make him treat or enter into compact with himself, which is the highest of Absurdities, in the Matter of Obligation. For it is an unexceptionable Rule of right Reason, that whoever acquires a Right to any thing, from the Obligation of another towards him, may relinquish that Right. If therefore the Obliger and Obligated should be one and the same Person, all Obligation there must be void of course; or rather there would be no Obligation begun: Yet the Stratonicean Atheist is guilty of this Absurdity, when he talks of Actions being *moral* or *obligatory*. For what *Being* can he find whereon to found this Obligation? He will say *Right Reason*, but that is the very Absurdity we complain of, because *Reason* is only an Attribute of the Person obliged, his Assistant to judge of his Obligations if he hath any from any other Being: To make *this* then the Obliger, is to make a Man oblige himself. If he says he means by *Reason* not every Man's particular Reason, but *Reason in general*; we reply, that this Reason is a mere abstract Notion, which hath no real Subsistence; and how that which hath no real Subsistence should *oblige*, is still more incomprehensible.

2. Moral Obligation, that is, the Obligation of a free Agent, further implies a *Law*, which enjoins and forbids; but a *Law* is the Imposition of an intelligent Superior, who hath Power to exact conformity thereto. But blind unintelligent Nature is no Law-giver, nor can what proceeds necessarily from it, come under the Notion of a Law: We say indeed, in common Speech, the *Law of Reason*, and the *Law of Necessity*; but these are merely popular and figurative Expressions: By the first, we mean the Rule that the Law-giver lays down for judging of his Will, and the second is only an Insinuation that *Necessity* hath, as it were, one property of a *Law*, namely that of *forcing*. But how any thing except a *Law*, in the proper philosophic Sense, can oblige a dependent reasonable Being endowed with Will, is utterly inconceivable. The fundamental Error in Mr. Bayle's Argument seems to be this: He saw the essential Difference of things, he found those Differences the adequate Object of the *Understanding*, and so, too hastily concluded them the adequate Object of the *Will* likewise. In this he was mistaken, they are indeed the adequate Object of the *Understanding*; and for this Reason, the *Understanding* is necessitated in it's Perceptions, and therefore is under the sole Direction of these necessary Differences; and is properly passive in the Affair. But the *Will* is not necessitated in its Determinations: for Instance, that three are less than five, the *Understanding* is necessitated to judge, but the *Will* is not necessitated to chuse five before three: Therefore the essential Differences of things are not the adequate Object of the *Will*, the *Law* of a Superior must be taken in, to constitute *Obligation* in Choice, or *Morality* in Actions,

The Atheist, *Hobbes*, seems to have penetrated farther into this Matter, than the Stratonicean of *Mr. Bayle*; he appeared to have been sensible that *Morality* implied *Obligation*, and *Obligation* a *Law*, and a *Law* a *Law-giver*: Therefore, having expelled the Legislator of the Universe, that *Morality* of Actions might not become quite foundationless, he thought fit to underprop it with his earthly God, the *Leviathan*; and make him the Creator and Supporter of *Moral Right* and *Wrong*.

But a Favourer of *Mr. Bayle's* Paradox may perhaps object, that as we have allowed a *Fitness*, and *Unfitness* in Actions, discoverable by the essential Difference of things; and as this *Fitness* and *Unfitness* implies *Benefit* and *Damage* to the Actor, and others, it being in Fact seen, that the Practice of *Virtue* promotes the *Happiness* of the Individual, or at least of the Species, and that *Vice* obstructs it: it may be said, that this will be sufficient to make *Morality*, or *Obligation*, in the Stratonian World; if not in the strict Sense of the Word, yet as to the Nature of the Thing. To this we reply, that in that World, whatever advanced human *Happiness*, would be only a natural Good; and *Virtue* as merely so, as Food and Covering: and, that which retarded it, a natural Evil, whether it was *Vice*, *Pestilence*, or unkindly Seasons. *Natural*, I say, in Contradistinction to *Moral*, or such a Good as any one would be obliged to seek or promote. For 'till it be made appear that Man hath received his being from the *Will* of another, and so depending on that other, is accountable to him for it; he can be under no *Obligation* to prefer Good to Evil, or even Life to Death. From the *Nature* of any Action, *Morality* cannot arise; nor from its *Effects*: Not from the First, because, being only reasonable or unreasonable, nothing fol-

lows but a *Fitness* in doing one, and an *Absurdity* in doing the other : — Not from the *Second*, because did the Productive Good or Evil make the Action moral, Brutes, from whose Actions proceed both one and other, would have *Morality*.

If it be further urged, that the Observance of these essential Differences is the Promoting the Perfection of a particular System, that contributes, in its concentration, to the Perfection of the Universe ; and that therefore a reasonable Creature is obliged to conform thereto : I answer, First, that (on the Principles before laid down) to make a reasonable Creature obliged, he must first be enforced by the whole, of which he is Part. This enforcement cannot here be by intentional Command, whose Object is free Agency, because the Stratonic whole, or universal Nature, is blind and unintelligible. It must force then by the Necessity of its Nature ; and this will, indeed, make Men obliged as Clocks are by Weights, but never as free Agents are, by the unnecessitating Command of an intelligent Superior, which only can make Actions moral.

But Secondly, an uniform perfect Whole can never be the Effect of Blind Fate, or Chance : but is the plain Image and Impression of one intelligent self existent Mind. And, even in such Case (to observe it, by the bye, to the Theist, who founds Morality on the natural essential Difference of things) it will still be found, that *Will* precedes Obligation. Now whether what is called *Eternal Verities* be dependent on the Will of God or no, is a Question, though methinks it need not be one amongst Philosophers and Divines ; the Cartesians affirming, and the Schools denying ; but this all Parties hold, that the Happiness and Perfection of the Universe, consequent to the Acting conformably

mably to those eternal Verities, is dependent thereon. Now, this Tendency being what occasions the Obligation in God himself to observe these Relations, and *Will* constituting that Tendency, it follows that *Will* is prior to all Obligation : And as it is of the Nature of the independent first Cause to be obliged only by his own Wisdom, so it seems to be of the Nature of all dependent intelligent Beings, to be obliged only by the *Will* of that first Cause. For we cannot so much as conceive an intelligent first Cause, whether eternal Verities be dependent or independent of him, without conceiving at the same Time a *Will*, that enjoins all his intelligent Creatures to act in Conformity to those Truths.

But to set this Matter in the clearest Light, I will beg leave, before I conclude, to take Notice of two or three Objections, not peculiar to the Stratoniceans, against Morality's being founded in Will.

Obj. 1. It is said, " That, as every Creature
 " necessarily pursues Happiness, it is *that* which
 " obliges to moral Observance, and not the Will
 " of God : because it is to procure Happiness that
 " we obey Command, and do every other Act :
 " and because if that Will commanded us to what
 " would make us unhappy, we should be forced to
 " disobey it." To this I answer, that when it is
 said *Morality is founded on Will* ; it is not meant
 that every Will obliges, but that nothing but Will
 can. It is plain the Will of an inferior or equal
 cannot be meant by it : It is not simply Will then,
 but Will so and so circumstanced : And why it is not
 as much Will that obliges, when it is the *Will of*
a Superior seeking our good ; as the *Will of a Superior*
simply, I am yet to learn. To say then that Hap-
 piness and not Will makes the Obligation, seems
 to me, like saying, in Mechanics, that when a

Weight is raised by an Engine, the *Wheels* and *Pullies* are not the Cause, but that universal affection of Matter called Attraction. If it be still urged that one can no more be called the Obliger than the other; because though Happiness could not oblige without Will; on the other Hand Will could not oblige without Happiness; I reply, this is a Mistake. Will could not indeed oblige to Unhappiness; but it would oblige to what should produce neither One nor the Other, though all Considerations of the Consequence of Obeying or Disobeying were away.

Obj. 2. It is said, "That if, according to the
 " modern Notions of Philosophy, the Will of
 " God be determined by the eternal Relations of
 " things, they are properly those Relations (as
 " Dr. *Clarke* would have it) that oblige, and not
 " the Will of God. For if A impel B; and B, C;
 " and C, D; it is A and not C that properly im-
 " pels D." But here I suspect the Objection con-
 founds *natural Cause and Effect* with *moral Agent and Patient*; which are two distinct Things, as appears from many Accounts, so from their Effects; the one implying *natural Necessity*, the other, only *moral Fitness*. Thus, in the Case before us, the eternal Relations are, if you will, the *natural Cause*, but the Will of God is the *moral Agency*: And our Question is, not of *natural Necessity* that results from the former, but, of *moral Fitness* that results from the latter. Thus that which is not properly the natural Cause of my Acting, is the moral Cause of it. And so on the Contrary. To illustrate what hath been said. — Something, I will suppose to be commanded me by the King; whose Will is inclined by a Favourite at Home, or determined by an Enemy Abroad; and theirs, by some other; and so on, in a long Series. Now who would be
 so

so extravagant as to say it was not the King's Will, that properly obliged me? but the first Will in the Series? Or who is so blind as not to see that the last Will is of the Nature of *moral Agency*, and the first of *natural Cause*? But the Followers of Dr. Clarke should, of all Men, have avoided this Confusion; because their Master has shewn at large, in his Defence of Liberty against Collins, that the Confounding moral Agency with natural Cause and Effect has occasioned much of the Embarras in that perplexed Question.

Obj. 3. It is said, "That not the Will of God, "but the essential Difference of things is the "Ground and Foundation of moral Obligation; "because if it be asked why we should obey God's "Will, the only Reply is, that *it is FIT we "should do so*. But *Fitness* arises from the essential "Difference of things; therefore it is that which "obliges, and not Will."—This is given chiefly to divert the Reader with one of those metaphysical Quibbles, which, to the Disgrace of this Science, or at least, of it's Professors, are with much Pains and Labour excogitated to embarras all abstract Questions of this Nature. And can any Thing be more pleasant than to make *that very Consciousness that Will, and Will only, can oblige*, an Argument that Will does not oblige? For this *Fitness* is just that very *Consciousness*, and nothing else: Which puts me in Mind of Collins's Reply to Le Clerc's Argument for human Liberty, from the *Mind's State of Indifference**. You mistake the Matter widely, says that profound Philosopher, *were a Man at Liberty in this State of Indifference, he ought to have it in his Power to be not indifferent, at the same Time he is indifferent; but being indifferent only, he is ne-*

* An Enquiry concerning human Liberty, p. 18, 19.

cessarily indifferent ; so not free. — But farther : When we say it is fit that God should be obeyed, we do not mean it is fit an inferior in Power or Wisdom should obey his Superior. — But it is fit a Creature should obey his Creator, because the first has only a natural Fitness, the latter a Moral. For in the first Case there being yet no Proof that our Perception of these essential Differences was intentionally given ; Will, from whence comes Obligation, is not concerned : Therefore no Morality in this Fitness. But in the latter Case, the Perception of these essential Differences are supposed to be intentionally given ; Will is therefore concerned ; is still Prior to Obligation ; and makes this Fitness, moral. So that now we see, though this Truth, that a Creature should obey his Creator, be called a Fitness ; as this, that an Inferior should obey his Superior, and a Thousand Others are called Fitnesses : Yet this common Name (and to common Names we are but too apt to think there are always common Natures) is owing only to the Poverty of Language : It being evident that the Fitness, that a Creature, who depends entirely on his Creator, should obey him, is infinitely different from any other Fitness that arises to a supposed independent Being, from the comparing and perceiving the Relations between his Ideas.

But so it hath happened that this most evident Truth, that *Morality is founded in Will*, hath been long controverted even amongst Theists. What hath much perplexed their Disputes is, that the Contenders for it have generally thought themselves obliged to deny (in order to support their Cause) the natural essential Differences of things, antecedent to a Law ; imagining, that the Morality of Actions would follow this Concession. But this is a Mistake, which the rightly Distinguishing between

tween things *naturally* and *morally* separable, as we have explained it above, will rectify. That the Distinction hath lain much unobserved, is owing to the unheeded Appetite and Aversion of the *Moral Sense*; which hath contributed greatly to confound it: And their Adversaries being in the same Prepossession that *One* inferred the *Other*, when they had clearly demonstrated the *natural essential Difference*, never gave themselves any farther Trouble, but delivered *this* as a Proof of the *Moral Difference*, though these be, in Reality, as we may see above, two distinct Things, and independent of one another. One of our most celebrated Writers¹ hath not escaped this Delusion: Who, dissatisfied with all the Principles, from which the preceding Writers, of his Party, had deduced the Morality of Actions, when he had demonstrated, with greater Clearness than any before him, *the natural essential Difference of Things*, unluckily mistook it for the *Moral Difference*; and thence made *the formal Ratio of Moral Good and Evil, to consist in a Conformity of Mens Actions to the Truth of the Case, or otherwise*. For it is a Principle with him, that a true Proposition may be denied or affirmed, or things may be denied, or affirmed to be what they are, by Deeds as well as by express Words; but had both Parties been pleased to consider *this natural essential Difference of Things*, as, what it must be confessed by both to be, THE RULE THAT GOD HATH GIVEN HIS CREATURES TO BRING THEM TO THE KNOWLEDGE OF HIS WILL, the Dispute had been at an End: And they had employed this *Difference*, not as the Atheist does, for the Foundation of Morality,

¹ The Religion of Nature delineated.

but, as all true Theists should do, for the *Medium* to bring us to that only sound *Foundation*, the *Will* and *Command* of God.

Thus have we seen, that an Atheist, as *such*, cannot arrive to the Knowledge of *Morality*.

2. We are now to prove our second Conclusion against Mr. Bayle's Argument — That the Idea of the *Moral Sense*, and the Knowledge of the *natural essential Difference of Things*, are, even in Conjunction, altogether insufficient to influence Society in the Practice of Virtue: which Influence is the Point in Question. — But we must previously observe, that the Arguments, which we allow to be conclusive for the Stratonian Atheist's Comprehension of the natural essential Difference of Things, take in only that Species of Atheism: the *Other*, which derive all from Chance and Hazard, are incapable of this Knowledge; and must be content with only the *Moral Sense* for their Guide. We shall therefore first enquire what this *Moral Sense* is able to do alone towards influencing virtuous Practice; and Secondly, what new Force it acquires in conjunction with the Knowledge of the *natural essential Difference of Things*.

1. Men are misled by the Name of *Instinct* (which we allow the *Moral Sense* to be) to imagine that Impressions made by it, are very strongly Operative, from observing them to be so in Brute Animals. But the Cases are widely different: In Beasts, the Instinct is invincibly forceable, as it is the sole Spring of Action. In Man, it is only a friendly Prepossession of the Judgment: and a Conciliator, as it were, between Reason and the other Appetites; all which have their turn in the Determinations of the Will. It must then consequently be much weaker, as but sharing the
Power

Power of putting upon Action with many other Principles. Nor could it have been otherwise without Destroying the Liberty of Choice. It is indeed so delicately interwove into the human Constitution, and so easily and so frequently effaced, that some have even denied the Existence of a Quality which, in many of the common Subjects, they cannot discover the least Traces of. It is indeed of so nice a Nature that one would be tempted to liken it to that *candid Appearance*, which the modern Philosophy shews us, does result from the Mixture of all Kinds of Colours. For, as here, if the Proportions of the several simple Colours be not equally mingled, no Whiteness will emerge from the Composition; so there, unless the original Passions and Appetites be rightly tempered and balanced, this *Moral Instinct* can never shew itself in any strong or sensible Operation. This being the Case of this *Moral Instinct*, it is evidently too weak, alone, to influence Practice: When the *Moral Sense* is made the Rule, and especially when it is the only Rule, it is necessary that its rectitude as a Rule should be known and ascertained. But it cannot to an Atheist: For till it be allowed there was Design in our Production, it can never be shewn that one Appetite is righter than another, though they be contrary and inconsistent. The Appetite therefore that, at the Present, is most Importunate to be gratified, must be adjudged to be the Right, how adverse so ever to the Moral Sense. But, supposing we should grant, this Moral Sense not to be so easily confounded with the other Appetites; but that it might be kept distinct; because it has this different Quality from the rest, that it is objective to a *Whole*, or intire Species; whereas the Others terminate in *Self*, or in the *private System*; though as to Whole and Parts, an Atheist must have

have a very slender and confused Idea ; granting this I say, yet human Actions, that are the Issue of *those Appetites*, would, in Time, effectually, though insensibly efface the Idea of the Moral Sense, in the generality of Mankind. Almost infinite are the popular Customs, in the several Nations and Ages of the world, that owe their Birth to the more violent Passions of Fear, Lust, and Anger. The most Whimsical and Capricious, as well as Inhuman and Unnatural, have arose from hence. It must needs therefore be, that Customs of this Original should be as opposite to the *Moral Sense*, as *those Appetites* from whence they were derived. But of how great Power Custom is to erase the strongest Impressions of Nature, much stronger than that of the *Moral Sense*, we may learn from that general Practice, which prevailed in the most learned and polite Countries of the World, of *exposing Children*, whereby that strong instinctive Affection for the Offspring was violated without Remorse. This Consideration, of the force of Custom, and it's Efficacy in wiping out and obliterating all the Impressions of Nature, and Sentiments of Humanity, would lead one into a very beaten Common-place ; which whoever would pursue, may turn to *Sextus Empiricus*, amongst the Antients, and *Montaigne* amongst the Moderns. It suffices, that the Fact is too notorious to be disputed. And what makes more particularly for my Argument is, that Custom is a Power which opposes the *Moral Sense* not partially, or at certain Times and Places, but universally. If therefore Custom in the politest States, where a Providence was taught and acknowledged, made such havock of Virtue ; into what Confusion must Things soon run, where there is no Barrier but the feeble Idea of the *Moral Sense* ? Nor can it be replied, that the Customs here spoke of,

as so destructive to the Moral Sense, are the Issue of false Religions, which Spring, and Fountain-head of Evil, Atheism at once dries up: For the Custom instanced in, is merely Civil; with which Religion had no Concern^m. And so are an infinite Number of other immoral Ones, carefully collected by the two Writers mentioned above.

2. But now Secondly, for our Stratonick Atheist; in whom, we suppose the *Moral Sense*, and the *Knowledge of the natural essential Difference of things* conjoined, as Motives to virtuous Practice. And, in Conjunction, they impart mutual Strength to one another: For as soon as the *natural essential Difference* is established and applied, it becomes a Mark to distinguish the *Moral Sense* from the other Appetites that are Irregular and Wrong. And, on the other Hand, the *Moral Sense* being thus carefully kept up and supported, the Mind, in its metaphysical Reasonings on the *essential Difference*, is guarded from running into Visions, and mistaking Chimeras for Realities.

The Question then is, Whether a clear Conviction of Right and Wrong, abstracted from all Will and Command, and consequently, from the Expectation of Reward and Punishment, be sufficient to influence the generality of Mankind in any tolerable Degree. That it is not, will, I am persuaded, be clearly proved by the following Consideration. All, who have considered human Na-

^m Though not to disguise any Thing, the Original of this horrid Custom of exposing Children, appears to me to have been the superstitious Regard the Antients had to their Seers and Fortune-tellers, when they predicted future Mischiefs, of which the Infant was to be the Cause. But then this Art of Predicting was by judicial Astrology, as it is now called; which is a Sort of Atheism, and not the least harmless Sort neither. For it is a popular Error, that Opinion, that Atheism is freer from Superstition than Theism.

ture attentively, have foundⁿ, that it is not enough that Virtue be owned to be the *greatest* Good (which the *Beauty* or *Reasonableness* of it may evince) to make Men embrace it. It must first be brought Home to them; and considered as a Good that makes an indispensable Part of their Happiness, before it can raise any Desire in them. For it is not necessary that a Man's Happiness in his own Opinion, should depend on the Attainment of the greatest possible Good; and he daily forms Schemes of compleat Happiness without it. But the Gratification of strongly craving Appetites, founded on Self-love, being thought to contribute much to our Happiness, and being at the same Time so opposite to, and inconsistent with Virtue, the Generality will never be brought to think that Virtue makes up a necessary Part of Human Happiness. To balance these Appetites, something then more interesting must be laid in the Scale of Virtue; and this can be only Rewards and Punishments, which Religion proposes, with a Morality founded on Will.

But this may be further made appear by what hath been observed above, concerning the Nature and Original of Civil Society. *Self-interest*, as we there shew, spurring to Action, by Hopes and Fears, caused all those Disorders amongst Men, which required the Remedy of Civil Society. And *Self-interest*, again, operating by Hopes and Fears in Society, afforded means for the Redress of those first Disorders; so far forth as Society could carry those Hopes and Fears. For to combat this universal Passion of Self-interest by another, as strong a One, at least, must needs be opposed to it: But *that* being the strongest in our Nature, all that

ⁿ See *Lock's Essay*, Chap. Of Power, § 71.

could be done was to contrive a Way to apply it to the contrary Purpose. Therefore because Society, as such, failed (from the natural Deficiency of it's Plan) in remedying the Disorders it was instituted to correct, and consequently was obliged to call in the Aid of Religion, as is above explained; it is evident it must proceed *still* on the same Principles of *Hopes and Fears*. But, of all the three Grounds of Morality, the third only thus operating, and an Atheist not having this third, Religion, that only gives it, must be unavoidably necessary for Society. Or in other Words, the *Moral Sense*, and the Knowledge of the *natural essential Difference of things* conjoined, will be altogether insufficient to influence the generality of Mankind in virtuous Practice. — I have been somewhat long on this Head; but I hope the Importance of the Subject will be judged a fair Excuse. Mr. Bayle's other Arguments shall be dispatched with greater Brevity.

SECT. V.

BUT Mr. Bayle, who well knew the force of this Argument, is unwilling to rest the Matter here; and therefore casts about for a Motive of more general Influence; which, he thinks, he finds in that strong Appetite to Glory, Praise, and Reputation, that an Atheist must needs have as well as other Men. And this makes his second Argument; which runs in these Words:

II. “It is most certain°, that a Man devoid of
“all Religion may be very sensible of world-
“ly Honour, and very covetous of Praise and

° Il est — fort certain, qu' un homme destitué de foi, peut être fort sensible à l' honneur du monde, &c. Pens. div. c. 179.

“ Glory

“ Glory. If such a One finds himself in a Coun-
“ try where Ingratitude and Knavery expose Men
“ to Contempt, and Generosity and Virtue are
“ admired, doubt not but he will affect the Cha-
“ racter of a Man of Honour; and be capable of
“ restoring a Trust, even where the Laws could
“ lay no hold upon him. The Fear of passing in
“ the World for a faithless dishonest Man would
“ prevail over his Avarice. And as there are Men
“ who expose themselves to a Thousand Inconve-
“ niences, and a Thousand Dangers to revenge
“ an Affront, which, perhaps, they have received
“ before very few Witnesses; and which they would
“ readily pardon, was it not for fear of incur-
“ ring Infamy amongst those they had to do with;
“ so I believe the same here; that this Person,
“ whom we suppose devoid of Religion, would,
“ notwithstanding all the Opposition of his Ava-
“ rice, be capable of restoring a Trust which it
“ could not be legally proved he had withheld.
“ When he sees that his good Faith will be at-
“ tended with the Applauses of the whole Place
“ where he resides; while his Perfidy might, some-
“ time or other, be objected to him, or at least so
“ strongly suspected, that he could not pass in the
“ World’s Opinion for an honest Man: For it is
“ that interior Esteem, in the Minds of others,
“ that we aspire at above all Things. The Words
“ and Actions, that mark this Esteem, please us
“ on no other Account, than as we imagine them
“ to be the Signs of what passes in the Mind: A
“ Machine so ordered as to make the most re-
“ spectful Gesticulations, and to pronounce the
“ clearest articulate Sounds, in all the Detours of
“ Flattery, would never contribute to give us a
“ better Opinion of ourselves, because we know
“ they are not the Signs of that good Opinion in
“ the

“ the Mind of another. On these Accounts
 “ therefore, he, of whom I speak, might sacrifice
 “ his Avarice to his Vanity, if he only thought he
 “ might be suspected of having violated the sacred
 “ Laws of Trust. And though he might even be-
 “ lieve himself secure from all Suspicion, yet, still,
 “ he could easily resolve to prefer the honourable
 “ Part, for fear of falling into that Inconvenience
 “ that has happened to some of publishing them-
 “ selves their Crimes, while they slept, or in the
 “ Transports of a Fever. *Lucretius* uses this Mo-
 “ tive to draw Men, without Religion, to Vir-
 “ tue.

To this we reply, 1. That it is indeed true, that
 Commendation and Disgrace are strong Motives to
 Men to accommodate themselves to the Opinions
 and Rules of those, with whom they converse; and
 that those Rules and Opinions, in a good Mea-
 sure, correspond, in most civilized Countries, with
 the unchangeable Rule of Right, whatever *Sextus*
 and *Montaigne* have been pleased to say to the Con-
 trary. For Virtue evidently advancing the gene-
 ral good of Mankind, and Vice obstructing it,
 there is no Wonder that *that* should be encouraged,
 with Esteem and Reputation, wherein every one
 finds his Advantage; and *that* discountenanced,
 by Reproach and Ignominy, which hath a quite
 contrary Tendency. But then we say, that seeing
 this good Opinion of the World may be as certain-
 ly (and more quickly and easily) gained by a well-
 acted Hypocrisy as by a sincere Practice of Virtue,
 the Atheist, who lies under no Restraints, with
 regard to the moral Qualities of Actions, will, of
 Course, prosecute the former Rout to Reputation;
 which is consistent with a full Indulgence to all
 his other Passions; while by aspiring to worldly
 Glory, in this latter Way, his Appetites will be
 at.

at constant War with one another. And he will be perpetually finding himself under the hard Necessity of *sacrificing*, as Mr. Bayle well expresses it, *his Avarice to his Vanity*. Now this Inconvenience he may avoid by resolving to be Honest only before Company, which will procure him enough of Reputation; and to play the Rogue in Secret, where he may fully indulge his Avarice, or what other Passion he is most addicted to. That this will be the very Scheme of him, who has no Motive but popular Reputation, to act virtuously, is so plain, that Mr. Bayle was reduced to the hardest Shifts imaginable to invent a Reason whereby it might seem possible that an Atheist, thus actuated by the Love of Glory, should behave himself honestly, when he might do the Contrary without Suspicion. These are his Words — “ And though he might believe himself free from all Suspicion, yet still he
 “ could easily resolve to prefer the honourable Part,
 “ for fear of falling into that Inconvenience which
 “ hath happened to some, of publishing themselves
 “ their Crimes, while they slept, or in the Transports
 “ of a Fever.” Here Atheism appears in all its Misery and Nakedness. To this did that wretched Philosophy drive its two ablest Apologists. For Mr. Bayle borrows the Argument from *Lucretius*. *Lucretius*, says he, *uses this Motive to draw Men, without Religion, to Virtue*. It had been to the Purpose to have told us, who ever, from the Time of *Lucretius* to his, had been *so drawn*. But they must know little of human Nature, who can suppose that the Consideration of these remote, possible indeed, but most unlikely Contingences, have ever any Share in the Determination of the Will, when we are deliberating on any Action of Importance, and distracted by the shifting uncertain Views of complicated Good and Evil. But granting this to be

be likely, or common, the Man Mr. *Bayle* describes could never get clear of the Danger of that Contingency, which way soever he resolved to act. Let us suppose him to take the honourable Part, even then, Sleep or a Fever might easily deprive him of the Reputation he affects: For I believe there is no Man, of this Turn, but would be as much ashamed to have it known that all his virtuous Actions proceeded from a selfish Vanity, as to be discovered to have stretched a Point of Justice, of which Civil Laws could take no Cognizance. It is certain that the first makes a Man as contemptible, in the Eyes of others, and more ridiculous than the latter; because the Advantage aimed at is fantastical: and one Discovery Sleep or a Fever is as likely to make as the other.

But, 2. Supposing our Atheist suspicious that he risques, in a Course even of the best acted Hypocrisy, the Danger of a Discovery; yet, as this Practice enables him to provide largely for himself by all the Means of secret Injustice; and observing that though indeed Esteem is in general annexed to apparently good Actions, and Infamy to bad; yet that there is no Virtue which procures so universally popular Esteem, if we may judge of it, as we must, by the exterior Marks, as *Riches and Power*; there being no Infamy which they will not efface or cover; and this, as we said before, being a Road to Esteem that leads him at the same time to the Gratification of his other Passions, there is no question to be made but he will chuse to run the hazard of all the Inconveniencies of a Discovery, which so useful a Practice may be indeed liable to, but which it can so readily repair. And here we are to observe, and I had need to observe it oft, Mr. *Bayle* so industriously affecting to forget it, that the People, the gross Body of Mankind,

are the only Subject in question. Now what they affect is *Popular Opinion*: But all, who know any thing, know this, that *Popular Opinion* is inseparably attached to *Riches and Power*.

But after many Detours, Mr. Bayle is at length brought to own that Atheism is indeed, in its natural Tendency, destructive to Society; but then he persists in it, that it never actually becomes so,

III. *Because* (and this is his next Argument) *Men do not act according to their Principles*, nor set their Practice by their Opinions. He owns this to have very much of a Mystery in it; but for the Fact, appeals to the Observation of Mankind: “For if “it was not so (says he) ^p how is it possible that “Christians, who know so clearly by a Revela- “tion, supported by so many Miracles, that they “must renounce Vice, if they would be eternally “happy, and avoid eternal Misery; who have so “many excellent Preachers — so many zealous “Directors of Conscience — so many Books of “Devotion; how is it possible, amidst all this, “that Christians should live, as they do, in the “most enormous Disorders of Vice?” And again,^q agreeably to this Observation, he takes notice, that “*Cicero* hath remarked how, that many Epicu- “reans, contrary to their Principles, were good “Friends and honest Men; who accommodated “their Actions not on their Principle, the Desire of “Pleasure, but on the Rules of Reason.” Hence he concludes: “Those lived better than they talk- “ed; whereas, others talked better than they “lived.” “The same Remark (says he) hath been “made on the Conduct of the Stoics: Their Prin-

^p — Si cela n'étoit pas, comment, &c. *Penf. div.* c. 136.

^q Cicéron l'a remarqué à l'égard de plusieurs Epicuriens, &c. c. 176.

“ ciple was, that all Things arrived by an inevita-
 “ ble Necessity, which God himself was subject to.
 “ Now this should naturally have terminated in
 “ Inaction; and have inclined them to abstain
 “ from Exhortations, Promises, and menacing.
 “ On the contrary, there was no Sect of Philoso-
 “ phers more given to preaching; or whose whole
 “ Conduct did more plainly shew that they thought
 “ themselves the absolute Masters of their Destiny.”
 The Conclusion he draws from all this, and much
 more to the same purpose, is^r that “ therefore Re-
 “ ligion doth not do that Service towards restrain-
 “ ing Vice as is pretended, nor Atheism that In-
 “ jury, in encouraging it: while each Professor
 “ acts contrary to his proper Principle.”

Now from this Conclusion, and from Words
 dropped up and down, of the mysterious Dark-
 ness of this Phænomenon, one would suspect Mr.
Bayle thought that there was some strange Princi-
 ple in Man, that unaccountably disposed him to
 act in opposition to his Opinions, whatever they
 were. And indeed so he must of necessity suppose,
 or he supposes nothing to the purpose: For if, on
 examination, it be found, that this Principle, what-
 ever it be, sometimes disposes Men as violently to
 act according to their Opinions, as at other Times
 it inclines them to act against them, the Principle
 will do Mr. *Bayle*'s Argument no service: And if
 the Principle, after all, should chance to prove on-
 ly the irregular Passions and Appetites of Men, it

^r *Contin. des Pens. div.* c. 149.

^f Je conçois que c'est une chose bien etrange, qu'un homme qui
 vit bien moralement, & qui ne croit ni paradis ni enfer. Mais j'en
 reviens toujours là, que l'homme est une certaine Creature, qui a-
 vec toute sa raison, n'agit pas toujours conséquemment à sa creance
 — ce seroit une chose plus infinie, que de parcourir toutes les bizarre-
 ries de l'homme. — Un Monstre plus monstrueux que les Centaures
 & que la Chimere de la fable. *Pens. div.* c. 176.

will conclude directly against him : And by good Luck, we have our Adversary himself fairly owning this to be the Case : For though, as I said, he most commonly affects to give this perverse Conduct in Men, a mysterious Air, the necessary Support of the Sophistry of his Conclusion ; yet, when he is off his guard, we have him declaring the plain Reason of it ; as where he says, “ The
 “ ‘ general Idea we entertain of a Man, who be-
 “ lieves a God and Heaven and Hell, leads us to
 “ think that he would do every Thing that he
 “ knows agreeable to the Will of God ; and avoid
 “ every thing that he knows to be disagreeable to
 “ him : But the Life of Man shews us, that he
 “ does the direct contrary. The Reason is this :
 “ Man does not determine himself to one Action
 “ rather than another by the general Knowledge
 “ of what he ought to do, but by the particular
 “ Judgment he passes on each distinct Case, when
 “ he is on the point of proceeding to Action. This
 “ particular Judgment may, indeed, be conform-
 “ able to those general Ideas of *fit* and *right*, but for
 “ the most part it is not so. *He complies almost al-*
 “ *ways with the reigning Passion of the Heart, to the*
 “ *Bias of the Temperament, to the Force of contracted*
 “ *Habits,*” &c. Now if this be the Case, as in truth it is, we must of Necessity draw the very contrary Conclusion from this Principle ; — That if *Men act not according to their Opinions*, and that they are the irregular Passions and Appetites that cause this Perversity, a Religionist will *often act against his Principles*, but an Atheist *always conformably thereto* : Because an Atheist indulges his vicious Passions, while he acts *according to his Principles*, in the same manner that a Religionist does,

* L'idée générale veut que, &c. *Pens. div.* c. 135.

when

when he acts *against* his. It is therefore only *accidental* that Men act contrary to their Opinions; — then when they oppose their Passions: or in Mr. Bayle's Words, when *the general Knowledge of what one ought to do, doth not coincide with the particular Judgment one passes on each distinct Case*; which Judgment is so frequently directed by the Passions: And this Coincidence always happens in an Atheist's Determination of himself to Action: So that the Matter, when stripped of the Parade of Eloquence, and cleared from the Perplexity of his abounding Verbiage, lies open to this easy Answer. — We allow, Man frequently acts contrary to his Opinions, both *metaphysical* and *moral*, in the Cases Mr. Bayle brings.

1. In *metaphysical*, — where the Principle contradicts common Sentiments, as the *Stoical Fate*, and *Christian Predestination*^u: There the Maintainers never acted, in Life, conformably to their Opinions. But this affects not the Case in hand, though Mr. Bayle, by producing this Instance, would insinuate, that an Atheist might be no more influenced, in his Actions, by his speculative Opinion of *no God*, than a Fatalist by his of *no Liberty*. But the two Cases are widely different: For, the Belief of a *God* firmly establishing the Duties of Morality, so opposite to the irregular Appetites, the contrary Belief taking away that Foundation, would consequently gratify those Appetites, which would then suffer, nay invite, the Atheist to act according to his Principles. But the Opinion of *Fate* having no such Influence on the acknowledged Morality of Actions, to the Gratification of the Appetites, and at the same time contradicting common Sentiments, we easily conceive how the Maintainers of it are

^u *Pens. div. c. 176.*

brought to act in Life, differently thereto. Nay it will appear, when rightly considered, that the Atheist would be so far from not acting according to his Opinions, that, was his Principle of *no God*, added to the Fatalist's of *no Liberty*, it would occasion the Fatalist then to act according to his Opinions, though he did not so before; if the Cause Mr. Bayle assigns for Men's not conforming their Practice to their Principles, be true: For the sole Reason why the Fatalist did not act according to his Opinions was, because they could not be used, while he was a Theist, to the Gratification of his Passions: For that, though it appeared, if there was no Liberty, there was no Merit in Actions; yet believing, at the same time, a God, the Rewarder and Punisher of Men, as if there was Merit in Actions, he would act likewise as if there was. But take away from him the Belief of a God, and there would be then no Cause why he should not act according to his Principle of Fate, as far as relates to Moral Practice.

2. *Next in Morals* — We own Men here, likewise, frequently act contrary to their Opinions: For the View (as we observed above) of the greatest confessed possible Good, which, to a Religionist, is the Practice of Virtue, will never, 'till it be considered as making a necessary Part of *our* Happiness, excite us to the Pursuit of it: and our Passions, while they continue importunate; and while one or other is perpetually solliciting us, being of a contrary Nature, prevent us from considering the Practice of Virtue as making a necessary Part of our Happiness. This is the true Cause of all that Disorder in the Life of Man, which Moralists so much admire; which the Devout lament; and which Philosophers could never find a Cure for: where there is a perpetual Conflict between the
Appetites

Appetites and Reason; and the Man's Practice is continually opposing his Principles. But, on the other hand, an Atheist, whose Opinions lead him to conclude Pleasure to be the greatest possible Good, will, by the Concurrence of his Passions, of course consider it as making a necessary Part of *his* Happiness: and then nothing can prevent his acting according to his Principles.

In a word, we own the Atheist, Mr. Bayle describes, would be as apt, nay apter, to act against his Opinions than a Theist: But they are only those slender Opinions concerning *the Obligation to virtuous Practice* which he hath given him: For if Man doth not pursue the greatest confessed possible good, 'till he considers it as making a necessary Part of his Happiness; I ask, which is the likeliest Method of bringing him so to consider it? Is it the Reflexion of *the Innate Idea of the Loveliness of Virtue*; or the more abstracted Contemplation on its *Essential Difference* to Vice; which the Atheist can only employ himself about? Is it not rather, the belief that the Practice of Virtue, as Religion teaches, is attended with an infinite Reward? These Opinions, I say, an Atheist is like enough to run counter to: But his Principles of Impiety, cherishing his Passions, we must never look to find at variance with his Actions: For our Adversary tells us, that the Reason why Practice and Principle so much differ, is the Violence of human Passions. From which, indeed, a plain Discourser would have drawn the direct contrary Conclusion.— That then, there is the greater necessity to inforce Religion, as an additional Curb to Licentiousness: For that a Curb it is, in some degree, all Parties are agreed in. And here, at parting, it will not be amiss to observe how much this Argument enervates one of the foregoing:

There we are made to believe that the Moral Sense and Essential Differences, are sufficient to make Men virtuous: Here we are taught, that these, with the Sanction of a Providence to boot, cannot do it, in any tolerable degree. — As to the Lives of his Epicureans, and other Atheists, which is the only part of this Argument remaining untouched, we shall first desire the Reader to take notice of the Fallacy he would obtrude upon us, in the Judgment he makes of the Nature of two different Principles, by setting together their Effects, as they appear; the *one* in the Majority of half a score Men, the *other* in the Majority of infinite Multitudes: A kind of Sophism, which small Sects in Religion have perpetually in their Mouths, when they compare their own Morals with those in large Communities, from which they dissent: — And then consider it more fully, in the Examination of his last and palmary Argument taken from Fact. For,

IV. In the last place, he says, “ That the
 “ Lives of the several Atheists of Antiquity fully
 “ shew, that this Principle does not necessarily
 “ produce Depravity of Morals.” He instances,
 “ in *Diagoras*, *Theodorus*, *Evemerus*, *Nicanor*, and
 “ *Hippon*: whose Virtue appeared so admirable to
 “ a Father of the Church, that he would enrich
 “ Religion with it, and make Theists of them,
 “ though in Contradiction to all Antiquity.” —
 And then descends to “ *Epicurus*; and his Follow-
 “ ers, whom their very Enemies acknowledged to
 “ be unblameable in their Actions, as the Ro-
 “ man *Atticus*, *Cassius*, and Elder *Pliny*.” — And
 closes this illustrious Catalogue with an Encomium
 on the Morality of *Vanini* and *Spinoza*. But this is

* *Pens. divers.* c. 174. & *Contin. des Pens. divers.* c. 114.

not all; for he tells us farther, * of whole Nations of Atheists, “ which modern Travellers have discovered in the Islands or Continents of *Afric* and “ *America*, who, in point of Morals, are rather “ better, than worse, than the Idolaters who live “ around them. It is true, that these Atheists “ are Savages, without Laws, Magistrate, or Civil “ Policy: But this (he says) † makes an Argument *a fortiori*: For if they live peaceably together out of Civil Society, much rather would “ they do so in it, where equal Laws restrain Men “ from Injustice.” He is so pleased with this Argument, that he reduces it to this Enthymeme ‡:

“ Whole Nations of Atheists, divided into independent Families, have preserved themselves “ from time immemorial without Law.

“ Therefore, much stronger Reason have we to “ think they would still preserve themselves, were “ they under one common Master, and one common Law, the equal Distributer of Rewards and “ Punishments.”

In Answer to all this, we say (having once again reminded the Reader, that the Question between us is, *whether Atheism would not have a pernicious Effect on the Body of a People in Society*) 1. That as to the Lives of those Philosophers, and Heads of Sects, which Mr. Bayle hath thought fit so much to applaud, nothing can be collected from thence, in favour of the general Influence of Atheism on Morality. To shew this, we will take a view of the several Motives these Men had to the Practice of Virtue: for hereby it will be seen, that not one of those Motives (peculiar to their several Chara-

* *Contin. des Pens. div.* c. 85. & c. 144.

† *Contin. des Pens. div.* c. 118.

‡ Des Peuples Athées divizes en Familles Independantes se sopt, &c.

cters, Ends, and Circumstances) reaches the gross Body of a People, seized with the Infection of this Principle. In *some* of them it was the *Moral Sense*, and the *Essential Difference of Things*, that inclined them to Virtue: But we have fully shewn above, that these are too weak to operate on the generality of Mankind; though a few studious, contemplative Men, of a more refined Imagination, and felicity of Temperament, might be indeed influenced by them. In *others* it was a warm Passion for Fame and Love of Glory. But though all Degrees of Men have this Passion equally strong, yet all have it not equally delicate: So that though Reputation is what all affect, yet the gross Body of Mankind is very little solicitous from whence it arises; and Reputation, or at least the Marks of it, which is all the People aspire to, we have shewn, may be easily gained in a Road very far from the real Practice of Virtue: in which Road the People is most strongly tempted to pursue it. Very small then is the Number of those, on whom these Motives would operate, as even *Pomponatius*, in his ample Confession taken above, hath acknowledged: And yet these are the most extensive Motives that these Philosophic Atheists had to the Practice of Virtue: For in the *rest* the Motive must be owned to have been less legitimate, and restrained only to their peculiar End, or Circumstances; as Concern for the Credit of that Sect they had founded, or espoused: which they endeavoured to enoble by this spurious Lustre. It is not easy to be conceived, but by those versed in Antiquity, how tender they were of the Honour of their Principles: The Conference between *Pompey* and *Posidonius* the Stoic, is a well-known Story: and if the Fear of only appearing ridiculous by their Principles was strong enough to make them do such violence to themselves,

selves, what must we believe the Fear of becoming generally odious would do, where the Principle has a natural Tendency, as we see *Cardan* frankly confesses, to make the holder of it the Object of public Detestation. But if the Sense of Honour was not strong enough, Self-preservation would force these Men upon the Practice of Virtue: For though of old, the Magistrate gave great Indulgence to Philosophic Speculations; yet this Principle of Atheism being universally understood to be destructive to Society, he frequently let loose his severest Resentment against the Maintainers of it: so that such had no other Way to disarm his Vengeance, than by persuading him in their Lives, that the Principle had no such destructive Influence. In a word then, these Motives being peculiar to the Leaders of Sects, we see that the virtuous Practice arising therefrom makes nothing for the Point in question.

2. But he comes much closer to it, in his next Instance; which is of whole Nations of modern Savages, who are all Atheists, and yet live more virtuously than their Idolatrous Neighbours. And their being yet unpolicied, and in a State of Nature, makes, he thinks, the Instance conclude more strongly against us. Now, to let pass unquestioned the Truth of the Fact, I shall endeavour to detect the Sophistry of the Conclusion from it (which I had before obviated in the Section concerning the Insufficiency of human Laws alone) in a fuller Explanation of that Reasoning.

It is most notorious that Man, in Society, is incessantly giving the Affront to the Laws of the Community. To oppose which, the Community is, as incessantly, busied in adding new Strength, and force to its Ordinances. If we enquire into the Cause of this Perverseness, we shall find it no other than

than the Number and Violence of the Appetites. The Appetites take their Birth from our real or imaginary Wants: Our real Wants are unalterably and necessarily the same: Exceeding few, and easily relieved; and arising only from the natural Imbecillity of our Condition. Our fantastic Wants are infinitely numerous, to be brought under no certain Measure or Standard: And increasing exactly in Proportion to our Improvements in the Arts of Life. But the Arts of Life owe their Original to Civil Society: And the more perfect the Policy is, the higher do those Improvements rise; and, with them, are our Wants, as we say, proportionably increased, and our Appetites inflamed. For the Violence of those Appetites, that seek the Gratification of our imaginary Wants, is much stronger than that raised by our real Wants: Not only because those Wants are more numerous, which gives constant Exercise to the Appetites; — and more unreasonable, which makes the Gratification difficult; — and altogether unnatural, to which there is no Measure; but, principally, because vicious Custom hath affixed a *Kind of Reputation* to the Gratification of the fantastic Wants, which it hath not done to the Relief of the real Ones. So that when Things are in this State, we have shewn above, that even the most provident human Restraints, without other Assistance, are insufficient. But in a State of Nature, unconscious of the Arts of Life, Men's Wants are only real; which are extreme few, and easily supplied. For Food and Covering are all that is necessary to support our Being. And Providence is abundant in it's Provisions, for those Wants: And while there is more than enough for all, it can hardly be, that there should be Disputes about any ones Share,

And

And now the Reader sees clearly how it might well be, that this Rabble of Atheists should live peaceably in a State of Nature, that the utmost Force of human Laws, in the improved Condition of Society could not hinder from running into Confusion. But the Sophistry of this Enthymeme is farther seen from hence. Not Mr. *Bayle* himself would maintain, that these Atheists, who live peaceably in their present State, without the Restraint of human Laws, would live so without that Restraint, after they had understood and practised the Arts of Life in Credit amongst civil policied People. In Civil Society then, which the Arts of Life inseparably accompany, an imposed Curb of Law would, he will own, be needful. I then argue thus, If a People who out of Society could live peaceably without the Curb of Law, cannot live so without it, in Society; what Reason have you to believe that, though out of Society they might live peaceably without the Curb of Religion, they could live so without it, in Society? The Answer to this must bring on again the Question, how strong the Curb on Man in Society should be; which we have fully examined in another Place. This Argument, therefore, proves nothing but the Folly of pretending to conclude, concerning Man in Society, from what we see of his Actions, out of it.

And here in Conclusion, once for all, it may not be amiss to observe, what an uniform Strain of Sophistry runs through all his Reasonings on this Head. The Question is, and I have been frequently obliged to repeat it, Mr. *Bayle* so industriously affecting to forget or mistake it, *Whether Atheism be destructive to the Body of a Society?* And yet he, whose Business is to prove the Negative, brings all his Arguments from Considerations, which either affect not the gross Body of Mankind, or of
that

that Body, in Society : In a Word, from the Lives of *Sophists* or *Savages* ; from the Example of a few speculative Men far above the Views of the common Body of Citizens ; or from *that* of a barbarous Crew of *Savages* much farther below them. All his Facts and Reasonings then being granted, they fall short and wide of his Conclusion.

But the last Stroke of his Apology is more surprising than all the rest : For having proved Atheism very consistent with a State of Nature, lest it should happen to be found not to be *so* with Civil Society but that one of them must rise upon the Ruins of the other, he gives a very palpable Hint which of the two he thinks ought to be preserved ; by making it a serious Question, discussed in a set Dissertation^a, WHETHER CIVIL SOCIETY BE ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY FOR THE PRESERVATION OF MANKIND^b? and very gravely resolving it in the Negative.

SECT. VI.

I HAVE now given, with the best Advantage of Representation, all the Arguments Mr. *Bayle* has employed to prove Religion not necessary to civil Society : By which it may be seen how little the utmost Force of Wit and Eloquence, in Conjunction, is able to produce for the Support of so outrageous a Paradox.

The Reader, will imagine, that nothing could now hinder us from proceeding, in the Order of our Discourse, to our second Proposition ; after having so strongly supported the first. But we

^a *Contin. des Pens. div.* c. 118.

^b Si les Societez sont absolument nécessaires pour conserver le genre humaine.

have yet to Combat a still more monstrous Paradox before we can thoroughly establish it.

As the great Foundation of our Proposition, *that the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments is necessary to civil Society*, is this, namely, *that Religion is necessary to civil Society*; so the Foundation of this last is, *that Virtue is so*. Now, to the eternal Opprobrium of our Age and Country, we have seen a Writer publicly maintain, in a Book so intitled, that PRIVATE VICES were PUBLIC BENEFITS. An unheard of Impiety, wickedly advanced, and impudently persisted in, against the universal Voice of Mankind: Where *moral Virtue* is represented as the Invention of Knaves; and *Christian Virtue* as the Imposition of Fools: where (that his Insult on common Sense, might equal that he puts on common Honesty) he assures his Reader, his Book is a System of most exalted Morals and Religion: And, that the *Justice of his Country*, which publicly delated him, was pure Calumny.

But I will undertake, and that in a very few Words, to shew the Admirers of the low impure Buffoonry and childish Rhetoric of this wordy Declaimer, that his whole Work is nothing but one continued Heap of Falshoods and Absurdities.

I. First then, it is to be observed, that, though his general Position be, *that private Vices are public Benefits*, yet in his Proof of it, he all along explains it by *Vice only in a certain Measure, and to a certain Degree*. And, as all other Writers have deduced the Obligation on private Men in Society, to be virtuous, and on the Magistrate severely to punish Vice, from the *Malignity of the Nature of Vice*; so he inforces this Obligation, on both, from the *Malignity of its Excess*. And indeed he had been fit only for Bedlam, had he not seen the Necessity of this Restriction.

Now we require no more to evince the Falshood of that Assertion which his whole Book is wrote to support, namely, *that Vice is absolutely necessary for a rich and powerful Society.*

For whatsoever is *absolutely necessary* to the well being of another, must be so, by it's essential Properties; the Use of which thing will be, then, in Proportion to it's Degree. And this the common Moralists observe of Virtue with regard to the State^c. But whatsoever is useful to another, only when in a certain Degree, is not so by its essential Properties; if not by its essential Properties, then, of Course, by Accident only; and, if by Accident, not necessary.

From hence it will appear, that a great and powerful Community, which is, in itself, a natural Good, and as such desirable; may procure and preserve its Grandeur without Vice, though Vice so frequently contributes to it: Because its Use not arising from its essential Qualities, but from some accidental Circumstance attending it, may be supplied by something that is not Vice, attended with the same Circumstance. As for Instance, the Con-

^c The first Part of this Assertion we thus prove. If A be absolutely necessary to B, it is, because neither C, nor D, nor any Thing but A, can supply the Wants of B. But if nothing but A can do this, it is, because the Supplial of those Wants are caused by the essential Properties of A; which essential Properties are incommunicable to all other Beings: The Communication of them to C, D, &c. making C, and D, A, which is absurd: For if the Supplial of the Wants of B, was caused by what was not essential to A, but accidental; then might the Wants of B, as well be supplied by C, D, &c. as by A; because that which is accidental only, may belong in common to several different Beings. The second Part I prove thus: Essential Qualities can never be excessive: Therefore that essential Quality of A, which in a lower Degree profits B, must in a higher Degree be still more useful to B. Contrarywise, accidental Qualities may be Excessive: So that that accidental Quality in A, which profited B, in a lower Degree, may injure B, in a higher.

sumption

sumption of the Products of Nature and Art, is the Circumstance that makes States flourishing. Now if this can be found in Actions not naturally vicious, then may a State become rich and powerful without the Assistance of Vice. That this Circumstance may, in Fact, be found in Actions not vicious, will next be shewn.

II. The Author descending to the Enumeration of his Proofs, appears plainly to have seen, that Vice, in general, was only accidentally productive of good: and therefore avoids entering into an Examination of the several Particulars. But selects out of his favourite Tribe, LUXURY, to support his execrable Paradox; and on this alone rests his Cause. By the Assistance of this ambiguous Term, he keeps something like an Argument on foot, even when he has left all the rest of his Vices to shift for themselves. And it must be owned, there is no Word more instantly and capriciously applied to particular Actions, or of more uncertain Meaning, when denominating those Actions, than the Word *Luxury*. For, in the Abstract, it is, like all other moral Modes, of the most exact determined Signification; and means, *the Abuse of the Gifts of Providence*. The Difficulty is only to know what is an *Abuse*. Men have two Ways of estimating it: The one, by the *Principles of natural Religion*; the other, by the *positive Institutions of revealed*. Those *Principles* all Men are reasonably well agreed in; but, concerning these *Institutions*, there are Variety of Sects and Opinions; in which Superstition and Fanaticism have much Influence. Consequently, those who estimate *Luxury* by this latter Rule, must differ extremely about it; and run into great Obscurity and Confusion: And, amongst so great diversity of Opinions, it would be strange, indeed, if some or other had not Ideas of

Luxury, that would serve the most monstrous Hypothesis; and much stranger, if so corrupt a Writer did not take the Advantage of them. And now, Reader, observe the Malice and Cunning of the Man. First, in order to perplex and obscure our Idea of *Luxury*, he hath laboured in a previous Dissertation on *the Origin of moral Virtue*, to destroy those very Principles, by whose sole Assistance we can clear and ascertain that Idea. Where he decries and ridicules the essential Difference of Things, the eternal Notions of Right and Wrong; and makes moral Virtue, which common Moralists deduce therefrom, the Offspring only of Craft and Pride. Nothing now being left to fix the Idea of *Luxury*, but the positive Precepts of Christianity, and having stript these of their only true and *infallible Interpreter*, the Principles of natural Religion, it was easy to bribe them to speak any Absurdities he could take hold of; and as easy to find these Absurdities supported by the Superstition and Fanaticism of those many Sects and Parties, who despising the Principles of the Religion of Nature, as *the weak and beggarly Elements*, soon came to regard the natural Appetites as the graceless Furniture of *the Old Man, with his Affections and Lusts*.

Having got Christianity at this Advantage, he empoisons all its Precepts, by giving us, for true and genuine Gospel, that commentitious Phantom of it, raised by the Hypocrisy of *Monks*, and the Misanthropy of *Ascetics*: which condemns, for *Abuse*, all Use of the Gifts of Providence farther than the bare Necessaries of Life. Hereby every thing becomes *Luxury* that is more than that. An Idea of it that exactly fitted our Author's Hypothesis: For if no State can be rich and powerful while its Members seek only a bare Subsistence; and, if what is more than a bare Subsistence, be *Luxury*, and
Luxury

Luxury be Vice ; the Consequence you see comes in pat, *private Vices are public Benefits.* Here, you have the sole Issue of all this Tumour of Words. But it is hard to think, that a Writer who discovers so much Depravity of Heart, had not farther Ends in this wicked Representation of natural and revealed Religion. He certainly had, for he gains by it these two considerable Advantages, — The fixing in his Followers a Prepossession for Vice ; and a Prejudice against Christianity. For what is stronger in Favour of Vice than that there is really no such thing as moral Duty ? What more in Discredit of Christianity, that that all the Enjoyments of Life are condemned by it as Vices ?

III. But true Christianity, as delivered by its Author, and his Disciples, is quite another thing than what Bigots and Fanatics are wont to represent it. It enjoins and forbids nothing, in moral Practice, but what natural Religion had before enjoined and forbid. Neither indeed could it, because one of God's Revelations cannot contradict another ; and because he gave us the first, to judge all others by. Accordingly we find, that though it be, indeed, one of the great Ends of Christianity (though not the main and peculiar End, as we shall shew hereafter) to advance the Practice of moral Virtue amongst Men, holy Scripture does not contain any regular or compleat System or Digest of moral Laws: The occasional Precepts there delivered, how excellent and divine soever, arising only from the Conjunctures and Circumstances that were the Subjects of those Preachings or Writings, in which such Precepts are found. For the rest — for a general Knowledge of the whole Body of moral Duty, the great Pandect of the Law of Nature is held open by them, to be searched and studied. Finally, says the Apostle Paul, *whatsoever*

Things are true, whatsoever Things are honest, whatsoever Things are just, whatsoever Things are lovely, whatsoever Things are of good Report, think on (that is) study these Things. But where vicious Custom, or perverse Interpreters, had depraved the Religion of Nature, there, particular Care was taken to remove the Rubbish of Time and Malice, and to restore the injured Moralities to their primitive Simplicity and Splendor.

The Religion of Nature then being restored, and made the Rule to explain and interpret the occasional Precepts of Christianity; what is *Luxury* by natural Religion, that, and that only must be *Luxury* by revealed. So that a true and precise Definition of it, which this Writer, triumphing in the Obscurity which, by these Arts, he hath thrown over the Term, thinks impossible to be given, so as not to suit with his Hypothesis, is easily settled. *LUXURY* is the using (and thereby abusing) *the Gifts of Providence, to the Injury of the User, either in his Person or Fortune; or to the Injury of any other, towards whom he stands in any Relation, which obliges him to Aid and Assistance.*

But now it is most evident, even from the very Instances this Writer brings of the public Advantages of Consumption, which he indiscriminately, and therefore falsely, calls *Luxury*, that the utmost Consumption may be made, and so all the Ends of a rich and powerful Society served, without Injury to the User, or of any one, to whom he stands related. Consequently without *Luxury*, and without Vice. When the Consumption is attended with such Injury, then it becomes *Luxury*, then it becomes a Vice. But then, let us take Notice, that *this Vice*, like all others, is so far from being advantageous to Society, that it is the most certain Bane and Ruin of it. It was this *Luxury* that destroyed impe-

imperial *Rome*. And the very Definition of it, given above, tells us the manner how; namely, by enervating the Body, debauching the Mind, beggaring the Fortune, and bringing in the Practice of universal Rapine and Injustice. But the wretched Absurdity of supposing *Luxury* beneficial to Society, cannot be better exposed, than by considering, that as *Luxury* is the Abusing the Gifts of Providence, to the Injury of those, to whom we stand related; and as the Public is that, to which every Man stands nearest related; the Consequence of this is, that *Luxury* is, at one and the same Time, beneficial and injurious to the Public. Nor can the Absurdity I here charge upon him, be evaded by saying it is deduced from a Proposition of his, and a Definition of mine set together. Because, however we may differ whether the Use of things, where no one is injured, be *Luxury*; yet we both agree in this, that where there is that injury in the Use, it is *Luxury*, and *Luxury*, in this Sense, he holds to be beneficial to Society.

The Case I here put, of *Luxuries* injuring the Public, by depriving the State of that Aid and Assistance from Particulars, which, the Relation they stand in to it, requires them to give, is no imaginary or unlikely Supposition. This Effect of *Luxury* it was that contributed, more immediately than any other, to the Destruction of the *Roman* State. For in the last Struggles for Liberty by a Few, against the Humour of a debauched luxurious People, when nothing but a sufficient Fund was wanting to enable those Godlike Men to restore the Republic, the richest Citizens, who yet wished well to their Country, could not be prevailed on to retrench from their private *Luxury*, to support the Public in this critical Exigency: which therefore,

long shaken by the *Luxury* of its Enemies, fell, now a Sacrifice to the *Luxury* of its Friends.

In a Word then, it is not *Luxury*, but the Consumption of the Products of Nature and Art, that is of so high Benefit to Society. That this latter may well be, without the former, appears plainly from the Definition given above. All the Difference is, and that a very essential one, when the Consumption is made without *Luxury*, infinitely greater Numbers share in it; when it becomes *Luxury*, it is confined to few. The Reason of this, and the different Effects this different Consumption must have on the Public, is most evident. Had the Consumption of the Commodities and Products of *Greece* when conquered, which sure were necessary to render the *Romans* polite and wealthy, been more equally made by that People, it would have been extremely beneficial. But being unjustly claimed by one part, exclusive of the rest, it became *Luxury* and Destruction. The *Roman* Historian shews us how it was brought about -- *Ibi primum insuevit exercitus populi Romani amare, potare, signa, tabulas pictas, vasa cœlata mirari, ea privatim ac publice rapere, delubra spoliare, sacra profanæque omnia polluere.* Till at length,

Sævior armis

LUXURIA incubuit, victumque ulciscitur orbem.

Thus, if it was worth Thanks, I might pretend, that, in half a Dozen Pages, I have shewn the real Design, detected the false Arts, and overthrown the bad Reasoning of a very popular, but surely, the most execrable Book that ever was wrote.

BOOK

B O O K II.

S E C T. I.

HAVING now, as we hope, fully proved our first Proposition, namely, *That the inculcating the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments is necessary to the Well-being of Society*, by Considerations drawn from the *Nature of Man*, and *Genius of Civil Society*; and cleared it from the Objections of licentious Wits;

We proceed to our Second Proposition; which is, **THAT ALL MANKIND, ESPECIALLY THE MOST WISE AND LEARNED NATIONS OF ANTIQUITY, HAVE CONCURRED IN BELIEVING AND TEACHING THAT THIS DOCTRINE WAS OF SUCH USE TO CIVIL SOCIETY.**

And if here we be more prolix than so clear a Case seems to require, and more frequent, and exact in our Quotations from the learned Languages, than the prevailing fastidious Delicacy of Taste seems willing to allow; we hope the Discoveries attempted in several important Matters of Antiquity will excuse it: or if not so, that, at least, the Reader will suspend his Censure, 'till he has seen, by the Sequel of this Discourse, how much this Fact contributes to the momentous Conclusion we have promised to demonstrate.

We shall endeavour to prove our Second Proposition,

I. From the Conduct of Legislators, and Instructors of Civil Policy.

G 4

II. From

II. From the Opinions of all the Wise and Learned amongst the Ancient *Literati*.

I. FROM THE CONDUCT OF LEGISLATORS, AND INSTITUTORS OF CIVIL POLICY : who always used to propagate and confirm Religion, wherever they established Laws; this being always first in their View, and last in their Execution. Religion was the Instrument they applied to collect together the Body Politic; and they used no other to fix, fashion, and adorn it : They *taught* it in civilizing Man; and *established* it to prevent his return to Barbarity, and a Savage Life.

That the Magistrate, as such, hath taken the greatest Care and Pains to inculcate and preserve Religion, we shall prove at large : That such Care and Pains must arise, and be employed on account of its confessed and experienced Utility to the State, will need no Proof.

But here it will be necessary, for the better comprehending the Force of our Demonstration, previously to remind the Reader of this material Truth : *That there never was, in any Age of the World, from the most early Accounts of Time, to this present Hour, any Nation, or People, who had a Religion, of which the chief Foundation and Support was not the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments; the Jewish People only excepted.* This, I presume, our Adversaries will not deny : Mr. Bayle, the indulgent Foster-father of Infidelity, owns it in the fullest Manner, and with the utmost Ingenuity. —
 “ Toutes les Religions du monde, tant la vraie que
 “ les fausses, roulent sur ce grand Pivot, qu’il y a
 “ un Juge invisible qui punit & qui recompense,
 “ *après cette vie*, les actions de l’homme tant exte-
 “ rieures qu’interieures. C’est de la que l’on su-
 “ pose que decoule la principale utilité de la Re-
 “ *ligion.*”

“ligion:” And thinks it was the Utility of this Doctrine that set the Magistrate upon inventing a Religion for the State. — “C’est le principal motif qui eut animé ceux qui l’auroient inventée.”

This Truth then, we beg the Reader always to have in mind: So that when, in the sequel of this Discourse, he meets with ancient Testimonies for the Necessity of Religion to Society, he may be confident, that the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, as the chief Idea included in that Term, must principally be meant: And on this account it is, that, very frequently, where the Ancients speak of those Utilities, which, it is evident from the Subject, can proceed only from the Doctrine of a future State, they pass the Cause under the common Name of Religion: On which account, we have not scrupled, throughout this Discourse, to use the same Liberty in the Application of one Term for the other, without any Apprehension of not being thought to understand our Argument, or of being misunderstood by others.

The Conclusion I would draw from this Observation, and the Reflexions on it, is this — That as all Mankind think it impossible that a Religion not founded on, and supported by the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, could subsist itself, or at least could derive any manner of Influence on the People; and consequently, when they speak of the publick Utilities of Religion in general, must necessarily suppose the Doctrine of a future State to be *mediately*, as Religion in general is *immediately* useful; that therefore when I bring the Facts and Opinions of Antiquity, which shew the Usefulness of Religion in general, to prove the

Usefulness of the Doctrine of a future State in particular, I speak home to the Purpose, and to the full Establishment of my second Proposition.

This being so, the Reader will perceive that had I done no more than produced *such Facts and Opinions*, I had gained my Point. But, over and above this, the greatest part of the present and following Books, will be employed in shewing, from ancient Facts and Opinions, the more than ordinary Care and Concern of all the Wise and Learned for perpetuating the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments in particular.

Having premised this, to prevent Mistakes, we proceed in the first place,

1. To shew in general the Civil Magistrate's Care in this Matter.

The Popular Belief of a Providence, and, consequently, of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, were so universal, that there never was, throughout all the Ages of ancient Time, any civil policied People, where these Doctrines were not of National Faith. The most ancient *Greek* Poets, as *Musæus*^b, *Orpheus*^c, *Homer*, *Hesiod*, &c. who have given Systems of Theology and Religion according to the popular Belief and Opinion, always place the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments as a fundamental Article: And all their Followers and Imitators have given Testimony to the same continued Plan. *Æschylus*, *Sophocles*, *Euripides*, *Aristophanes*, whose Profession it was to represent the Manners and Opinions of all civil policied Nations, whether *Greeks* or *Barbarians*, are full and express to the same purpose. It is perpetuated in the Writings of every ancient Historian and Philosopher, which it would be endless to

^b *Plato Rep.* lib. 11.

^c *Laocul. vita Plutar.*

quote. But *Plutarch*, the most knowing of them all, is so very express in this Matter, that I shall beg leave to transcribe his Words. — “Examine^d (says he in his Tract against *Colotes* the Epicurean) “the Face of the Globe, and you may find Cities “unfortified, unlettered, without a regular Magistrate, or distinct Habitations; without Possessions, Propriety, or the Use of Money, and unskilled in all the magnificent and polite Arts of Life: But a City without the Knowledge of a God, or the Use of religious Rites to procure Good, and to deprecate and avert Evil, no Man can or ever will find.” And, in his Consolation to *Apollonius*, he declares it^e was so ancient an Opinion that good Men should be recompensed after Death, that he could not reach either the Author or Original of it. To the same purpose had *Cicero* and *Seneca* declared themselves before him, the first in these Words: “As our innate Ideas discover to us that there are “Gods, whose Attributes we deduce from Reason; “so, from the Consent of all Nations and People, we “conclude that the Soul is immortal.” — The other, thus: “When^g we weigh the Question of the Immortality of the Soul, the Consent of all Mankind,

^d — ἔνθα δ' ἂν ἐπὶ τῶν καὶ πόλεως ἀτεχνήτους, ἀγεγραμμάτους, ἀεὶ σιλότους, αἰοίκους, ἀτεχνήτους, νομισματικῶς μὴ δεομένης, ἀπείρους θεῶν καὶ γυμνασίων ἀνέρου ἢ πόλεως καὶ αἰθέρος, μὴ χρωμένης οὐχ αἵματι, μηδὲ ὄρεσι, μηδὲ μαντείαις, μηδὲ θυσίαις ἐπὶ ἀγαθοῖς, μηδὲ ἀπειροπαῖς κακῶν, εἰδὲς ἐστὶν εἰδὲς ἔσται γελοιῶς θεοσεβής.

^e — Καὶ ταῦθ' ὅτως ἀρχαῖα καὶ παλαιὰ διατελεῖ νομισθέντα παρ' ἡμῖν, ὥς τὸ πᾶσι πάντες οἶδεν εἰδὲς ὅτι χρόνος τ' ἀρχαῖον, ὅτι τ' ἀρχαῖον, ἀλλὰ τ' ἀπειρον αἰῶνα τυγχάνουσι διὰ τέλους ὅτι νομισθέντα.

^f — Ut Deos esse naturâ opinamur, qualesque sint ratione cognoscimus; sic permanere animos arbitramur consensu nationum omnium. *Tuscul. Disp.* l. i. c. 16.

^g Cum de animarum æternitate differimus, non leve momentum apud nos habet consensus hominum, aut timentium inferos aut colentium. *Ep.* 117.

“in their Fears and Hopes of a future State, is no
“light Argument with us.”

In a word, *Sextus Empiricus*, when he would discredit the Argument for the Being of a God, brought from universal Consent, observes that it would prove too much; because it would prove the Truth of the *Poetic Fables of Hell*, in which there was as general a Consent^b.

But, of all Nations, the *Ægyptian* was most celebrated for its Care in cultivating Religion in general, and the Doctrine of a future State in particular: insomuch that one of the most ancient *Greek Historians* affirms, that *They were the first who built Altars and erected Statues and Temples to the Gods^c, and who taught that the Soul of Man was immortal. And Lucian tells us^d, that they were said to be the first who had the Knowledge of the Gods.* Which only amounts to this, that they were the first and wisest policed People: as will appear presently.

And now to prove the Magistrate's Care from hence: For this Account of the Antiquity and Universality of Religion is not given to prove its Truth, for which purpose other Writers have often employed it, but to manifest its Utility; which will be best done by shewing what Share the Magistrate had in it.

I. Now though, as we observed, no policed Nation was ever without a Religion in general, and this Doctrine in particular; and though it was of popular Belief even before Civil Policy was instituted amongst Mankind; yet were there formerly,

^b *Adv. Physicos*, l. 8. c. 2.

^c — Βασιλεὺς τε καὶ ἀγάλματα καὶ τὰς θεαῖσι δῶνῆναι (φείας) ἔργατος. *Hered. Euterpe*, c. 4. — Πρῶτοι ἢ καὶ τόνδε τ' λόγον Αἰγύπτιοι εἰσι οἱ εἰσάγοντες ὡς ἀνθρώπων ψυχὴ ἀθάνατος ἐστὶ. *Id. ib.* c. 123.

^d Πρῶτοι μὲν ἀνθρώπων Αἰγύπτιοι λέγονται θεῶν τε ἔκδοσαν λαοῦν. *De Dia Syria, initio.*

and now are many Savage Nations, that long lost all Traces of Religion : A Fact which implies some extraordinary Care and Art in the Magistrate for its Support and Preservation. For if Religion hath been supported in all Places, at all Times, and under all Circumstances, where there was a Magistrate and Civil Policy ; and scarce in any Place, or under any Circumstance, where these were wanting ; what other Cause than the Magistrate's Management can be assigned for it ? This, to considering Men, will be of weight.

If it should be said, which, I think, is the only plausible Thing can be said, that the Reason why the Citizen had Religion, and the Savage none, might be, That, amongst the Advantages of Civil Life, the Improvement and Cultivation of the Mind is one ; which necessarily brings in the Knowledge of God and Religious Observance : To this, we think it sufficient to reply, That all the national Religions of the ancient and modern Gentile World are so gross and irrational, that they could not be the result of the Discoveries of improved Reason ; but were plainly fitted to the Capacity of Minds yet rude and uncultivated ; with a Mixture of Impositions of the Magistrate's tempering, regarding the Genius of the People, and the Nature of their particular Constitution.

To give a modern Instance of what we have been saying : — The *Mexicans* and *Peruvians* in the South, and the People of *Canada* in North America, were on a level with regard to speculative Improvement ; or, if there was any Advantage, the *Canadians* had it. The first, when discovered, had a Religion formed and settled ; the other not so much as the Rudiments of any : but such a Religion, as discovered something worse than mere Ignorance, but which never could be the Result of speculative Thinking :

Thinking : However a Religion it was that taught the great Articles of the Worship of a God, a Providence, and a future State. Now how happened it that these two great Empires had a Religion, and the *Canadians* none, but that their Founders saw it necessary to establish and perpetuate one for the Benefit of the State? a Circumstance, the *Canadians* were never under. If this will not be allowed the Reason, it will be difficult to assign one. Let us suppose, according to the Objection, that Gentile Religion owes its Birth to the improved and cultivated Mind. Now, if we make Collections according to the Course of Things, it will be found more likely that these Northern Savages should earlier gain, and longer preserve the Notions of God, and the Practices of Religion, than the Southern Citizens, uninfluenced by their Magistrates.

The Way of Reason, adapted to the common Capacities of Mankind, of coming to the Knowledge of a superior Being, is that very easy one of contemplating the Works of Nature : For this Employment the Savage would have fitter Opportunities by far, afforded by his vacant sedentary Life; and by his constant View of Nature, in every Part naked and unsophisticated; which all his Travail and Amusements perpetually presented to him. The *Comte de Boulainvilliers*, a Writer by no means prejudiced in favour of Religion, gives this very Reason why the *Arabians* preserved so long, and with so much Purity, their Notions of the Divinity¹.

On the other hand, every Thing of Nature, by which we come to the Knowledge of a first Cause,

¹ *La Vie de Mahomed*, p. 147. *Ed. Amf.* 1731. Je reviens volontiers à la louange de la solitude des Arabes — elle a conservé chez eux plus longtems, & avec moins de mélange le sentiment naturel de la véritable Divinité, &c.

would

would be quite hid from the Southern Citizen, buried in the Works of barbarous Arts, and inhuman Inventions; and taken up with the slavish Attendance on a cruel Tyrant.

Nor, if we may credit the Relations of Travellers, do the Northern People any more neglect to exercise their rational Faculties than the Southern: It is constant, they are observed to have better Intellects than those nearer the Sun: which, being owing to the Influence of Climes, is experienced to hold all the World over. Notwithstanding this, the Issue proved just the contrary; and, as we said, the *Peruvians* and *Mexicans* had a Religion, the *Canadians* none at all.

Who then can any longer doubt that this was owing to the Care and Contrivance of the Magistrate? But indeed (which was the Reason why I preferred this Instance) Matter of Fact confirms our Reasoning. The Founders of these two Monarchies pretended to be the Messengers and Offspring of the Gods; and, in the manner of the *Grecian*, and other Legislators, of whom more presently, pretended to Inspiration, taught a Religion, and constituted a Form of Worship.

II. But not only the *Existence*, but the *Genius* of Pagan Religion, both as to the *Nature* of their Gods, the *Attributes* assigned to them, and the *Mode of Worship* in civil use, shews the Magistrate's Hand in its Support.

I. The Idolatry of the Gentile States was chiefly the Worship of dead Men; and those, Kings, Legislators, and Founders of Civil Policy. That this was the Magistrate's Manufacture is evident from the Benefit resulting to the State both from the *Consecration* and the *Worship*. For, 1. What could be a greater Excitement to Virtue in Governors, than to be assured, that the Public Benefits, of which
they

they should be the Inventors, Improvers, or Preservers, would be rewarded with an Immortality of Fame and Glory. *Cicero* gives this as the very Reason of the Institution: — “Atque in plerisque civitatibus intelligi potest, augendæ virtutis gratiâ, quo libentius reipublicæ causa periculum adiret optimus quisque, virorum fortium memoriam honore deorum immortalium consecratam. Ob eam enim ipsam causam *Erectheus* Athenis filiæque ejus in numero deorum sunt.” 2. What could make the People so observant of their Civil Institutions, as a belief that the Makers, Framers, and Administrators of them were become Gods; and did dispense a peculiar Providence in their Protection and Support?

But the sure Records of Antiquity support our Argument. The *Egyptians* were the first People that perfected Civil Policy, and established Religion: And they were the first too that deified their Kings, Legislators, and Publick Benefactors: As we may collect from the Passage of *Herodotus*, quoted above, which says, *they were the first who built Altars, and erected STATUES and Temples to the Gods.* And the erecting Statues was by this Historian esteemed a certain Mark that the Worshipers believed the Gods had human Natures: For speaking of the *Persians*, who had no Statues of their Gods, he tells us the Reason was, *because they did not believe with the Greeks that the Gods had human Natures*°, that is, were dead Men deified: A Practice,

as

^m *Nat. Deor.* l. 3. c. 19.

ⁿ “Τὰς δὲ θεάς, αἰθεράπους μὲν ὑπάρχουσιν θεοτάς. διὰ δὲ σωματικὴν καὶ τοῦτον αἰθεράπουν ὁμοιωσάν, τοῦτέστι τὸ ἀθανάσιον. *Diod. Sic.* l. 1. *Voyez aussi lettres à Mr. H. sur les premiers Dieux ou Rois d’Egypte.* Par. 1733.

^o “Ὅτι μὲν ἑμὲ δοκεῖν, ὅτι ἐκ αἰθεραποφύτας ἰσχυροὶ τὰς θεάς, καὶ ἄλλοι ἐν Ἑλλήσι, εἶναι. *Clio*, c. 131. *Valia* explains the Word αἰθεραποφύτας by *ex hominibus ortos*; and, I think, rightly. But

our

as we say, invented by the *Egyptians*; who, in process of time, taught the rest of the World their Trade. So when Arts and Civil Policy were brought into *Greece* by *Cadmus* and *Ceres* (the first, though a *Phœnician* by birth, being an Inhabitant of *Thebes* in *Egypt*; the other, though coming immediately from *Sicily*, being yet a natural *Egyptian*) then, and not 'till then, began the Custom of deifying dead Men; which soon over-ran all *Greece* and the rest of *Europe*. The great Sir *Isaac Newton*, who, probably, had not this Matter in his Thoughts, hath yet a remarkable Passage to our purpose in his *Chronology of the Greeks*: “Idolatry (says he) began in *Chaldæa* and *Egypt*. — The Countries upon the *Tigris* and the *Nile* being exceeding fertile, were first frequented by Mankind, and grew first into Kingdoms; and THEREFORE began first to adore their dead Kings and Queens: — Every City set up the Worship of its own Founder and Kings, and by Alliances and Conquests they spread this Worship, and at length the *Phœnicians* and *Egyptians* brought into *Europe* the Practice of deifying the Dead.”

2. As to the Attributes and Qualities assigned to their Gods: these always corresponded with the Nature and Genius of the Civil Government: If this was gentle, benign, compassionate, and forgiving; Goodness and Mercy made up the Essence of the Deity:

our learned *Stanley*, in his Notes to the *Persians* of *Æschylus*, thinks otherwise: and that it rather signifies *humana forma præditos*. I suppose it appeared harsh to him, that any one could imagine the Gods had human Natures; but the meaning is explained above. That Statues of the Gods in human form were a plain Indication of their Original from Mortality, is so evident in the Opinion of *Eusebius*, that he says, ὁ γὰρ τοῖς ἀλλήλοις λόγον βούλη καὶ κέρχατε, μονοθεῖα φωνὴν ἀφίετε, θεοὺς ἄνδρας μαρτυρῶν γεῖναι τοὺς δηλεῖται. *Euseb. præpar. β. γ.*

but if severe, inexorable, captious, or unequal ; the very Gods were Tyrants ; and Expiations, Atone-ments, Lustrations, and bloody Sacrifices composed the System of religious Worship. This I have observed to hold so universally throughout Antiquity, that by the Rule here delivered a Man might, on being told the Genius of any particular Government, rightly pronounce on the Nature of their Gods.

3. *As to the Mode of Worship in Civil Use* : the *Object* of that we call *Religion* being God, considered as the Creator and Preserver of Mankind, a Species of rational Beings ; it is evident, the *Subject* of it is each individual of that Species. This is the true Idea of Religion, which common Sense discovers to us. But now, in ancient Paganism, *Religion* was a very different thing : It had for its *Subject* not only each individual, the *natural Man*, but likewise the *artificial Man*. Society ; for whom, and by whom all the *public* Rites and Ceremonies of it were instituted and performed. And while that Part of Pagan Religion, whose *Subject* was Individuals, bore an inferior Part, and was confessed to be under an unequal Providence, which brought in the Doctrine of a future State for its Support ; the other, whose *Subject* was the Society, taught an equal Providence, exactly administered to the *artificial Man*. The Consequence of this was, Religion held the Government in partnership ; and nothing was consulted or executed without Advice of the Oracle. Judgments, Prodigies, and Portents were as common as Civil Edicts ; and as constantly bore their Share in the publick Administration : For these were always understood to be national Directions ; either Declarations of divine Favour, or Denunciations of impending Punishment ; in which Particulars, as such, were not at all

all concerned: as is evident from hence, that to accept or avert the Omen; to gratulate the Mercy, or deprecate the Judgment, the constant Method was the Revival of old Rites, or the Institution of new ones. A Regulation of Manners, or the Establishment of sumptuary Laws never made part of the State's Atonement to the Gods.

The Singularity and Notoriety of this Fact struck the great Mr. *Bayle* so forceably, that imagining this more public Part to be the whole of Paganism, he too hastily concluded, that *the Worship of false Gods in the ancient World, did not at all influence Morals*^a: and from thence formed an Argument to support his favourite Question in behalf of Atheism. This was a strange Extream, and unworthy his Character in the Knowledge of Antiquity: For though it be plain indeed that this part of Pagan Religion had no Influence on Morals, it is utterly false that the other Part of it, whose Subject was Individuals, had not: For in the Doctrine of the future State of Rewards and Punishments, which was the Foundation of, and inseparable from this sounder part of Pagan Religion, the Merit and Demerit, to which they were annexed, were Virtue and Vice only; to which, indeed, was added Contempt of the Gods: but by that was not meant any Neglect in particular Modes of Worship, but rank Atheism, as supposing all Morality to be destroyed by it. This we shall prove at large in the fourth Section of the present Book: Though I am far from denying, that the Nature of one part of Paganism did lead Individuals, in the other part of it, into many wrong Conclusions, concerning the Efficacy of exterior Acts of Religion in particular Cases.

^a *Pensées diverses sur une Comete, &c. And Réponse aux Questions d'un Provincial. And Continuation des Pensées diverses, &c.*

But what seems to have occasioned Mr. *Bayle's* Mistake in this Point (besides his following the Fathers, who in their *Declamations* against Paganism have said a great deal to the same Purpose) was his not reflecting that ancient History^r, the Repository of all that concerns the public Part of *Pagan* Religion, only represents one Part of the Influence of Paganism, that which it had on the Public as a Body. The other Part, the Influence it had on Individuals, it passes over in Silence as not its Province. — But to return.

Whoever now considers the Genius of Paganism in this View, and whoever hath considered it at all, must be struck with this View, can no longer doubt that the Civil Magistrate had a great Hand in framing and modeling *Religion*. What it was that enabled him to give this very extraordinary Cast to Paganism, is not hard to discover. It was indeed the necessary Consequence of those general Notions, which, by his Invention and Encouragement, had overspread the Heathen World. 1. That there were local tutelary Deities, who had taken upon

^r What we have said above of the Genius of Paganism well accounts for a Circumstance in ancient History that very much embarrasses the Critics. They cannot conceive how it happened that the best ancient Historians, who understood so well what belonged to the Nature of each Composition, and how to give every sort of Work its due Form; and were besides so free from all vulgar Superstition, should so much abound in Descriptions of Religious Rites and Ceremonies; and in Relations of Omens, Prodiges, and Portents. Many a ridiculous Hypothesis has been framed to give a Solution of this Difficulty: and many a tedious Work been compiled to justify these ancient Historians, upon mere Modern Ideas. *Toland*, who never quoted old Writers but to abuse *the Religion of his Country*; nor ever attempted to explain them without disgracing *the Learning of it*, has made a long, dull Discourse to free *Livy* from Superstition. — But now a plain and easy Answer may be given to this Difficulty.

This Part of *Pagan* Religion was so interwove with public Transactions, that it became *essential* to civil History.

themselves,

themselves, or to whom was committed the Care and Protection of particular Nations and People : of which, more hereafter. 2. That those great Benefactors of Mankind, who had reduced the scattered Tribes and Clans into Civil Society, were become Gods. 3. And Lastly, That their Systems of Laws and Civil Institutes were plan'd and digested by the Direction of the Legislator's Patron Deity^c.

On the whole then, these Considerations, of the *Preservation* of Religion in general, of the *Being and Attributes* of the Gods, and the *Mode of public Worship*, will, I am persuaded, incline my Reader to believe that, for the *Universality of Religion*, the World was much indebted to the Civil Magistrate ; how much soever the illegitimate or unnatural Constitution of particular States, or the defective Views of particular Legislators, may have contributed to deprave the true Religion of Nature. The learned St. *Austin*, whose Master-piece was his great Knowledge of Antiquity, seems to have been influenced by such like Considerations, when he gives it, as the Result of his Enquiries ; that the Civil Magistrate had a large Share in the Pagan Superstition. His Words are, “ Quod utique non aliam ob causam factum videtur, nisi quia hominum vel prudentium & sapientium negotium fuit populum in Religionibus fallere—Homines Principes ea, quæ vana esse noverant, Religionis nomine populis tanquam vera suadebant: hoc modo eos civili Societati velut arctius alligantes, quo subditos possiderent.”

But if now it should be objected against all we have said above, that it was natural for the People,

^c See the Beginning of the next §.

De Civit. Dei. l. 4. c. 32.

left to themselves, to run into *any* of these Errors of Superstition: We may well allow it, without prejudice to our Argument: For they are always Notions apt to be entertained and cherished by vulgar Minds, whose current the Wise Magistrate is accustomed and practised to turn to his Advantage. For to think him capable of new modeling the human Mind, by making Men religious whom he did not find so, is, as shall be shewn hereafter, a senseless Whimsy, whereby the Atheists would account for the Origin of Religion. And when it appears that all these various Modes of Superstition concur to promote the Magistrate's End and Purpose, it can be no longer doubted that he gave them that general Direction. — But the particular Parts of *Gentile* Religion, which farther strengthen and confirm this Reasoning, we shall not insist on here. Their Original will be clearly discovered, when we have shewn the particular Methods employed by the Magistrate for this great Purpose. What those Methods were, the Course of our Argument now leads us to consider.

S E C T. II.

WE have shewn in general, from the Effect, that Law-givers and Founders of Civil Policy did indeed use much Art and Industry in the Propagation and Maintenance of Religion. We shall now endeavour to explain the Causes of that Effect, in a particular Enumeration of the several Arts therein employed.

I. The first Step the Legislator took, was to proclaim an extraordinary Revelation from some God; by whose Command and Direction he pretended to have instituted the Policy he would recommend to the People. Thus *Amasis* and *Mnevis*, Law-givers of

of the *Egyptians* (from whence this Custom, as all other fundamental ones of Civil Policy and Religion, first arose) pretended to have received their Laws from *Mercury*; *Zoroaster* the Law-giver of the *Bactrians*, and *Zamolxis* Law-giver of the *Getes*; from *Vesta*; *Zathaus* the Law-giver of the *Arimaspi*, from a Good Spirit or Genius; and all these most industriously and professedly inculcated the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments. So *Rhadamanthus* and *Minos*, Law-givers of *Crete*, and *Lycaon* Law-giver of *Arcadia*, pretended to an Intercourse with *Jupiter*; *Triptolemus* Law-giver of the *Athenians*, affected to be inspired by *Ceres*; *Pythagoras* Law-giver of the *Crotoniates*, and *Zaleucus* of the *Locrians*, ascribed their Laws to *Minerva*; *Lycurgus* of *Sparta* to *Apollo*; and *Romulus* and *Numa* of *Rome*, the one to *Consus*, and the other to the Goddess *Egeria*^u. In a Word, there is scarce a Legislator, recorded in ancient History, but what thus pretended to Revelation, and divine Assistance in forming his Institutions. But had we the lost Books of *Legislators* wrote by *Hermippus*, *Theophrastus* and *Apollodorus*^w, we should doubtless have received great Lights in the Subject of our Enquiry, as well as a much fuller List of these inspired Statesmen. The same Method was practised by the Founders of the great outlying Empires, as Sir *William Temple* calls them. Thus the Founder of the *Chinese* Monarchy was called *Fagfour* or *Fansur*, the Son of Heaven, as we are told by the *Jesuits*, from his Pretensions to that Relation. The royal Commentaries of *Peru* inform us, that the Founders of that Empire were *Mango Copac*,

^u *Diod. Sic.* l. 1. & 5. *Ephorus* apud *Strabonem*, l. 10. —
 Teste veteri Scriptore apud *Suidam* in [*Λουκιαν*] — *Arist.* apud
Schol. Pind. ad 10. *Olymp.*

^w *Athen.* l. 14. *D. Laertius*.

and his Wife and Sister *Coya Mama*, who proclaimed themselves the Son and Daughter of the *Sun*, and sent from their Father to reduce Mankind from their *Savage* Beastial Life to one of Order and Society. *Thor* and *Odin* the Law-givers of the *Western Goths*, pretended likewise to Inspiration, and even Divinity*. The Revelations of *Mahomet* the Leader of the *Arabians*, are too well known to be insisted on. The Race of these inspired Law-givers seems to have ended in *Genghizcan* the Great, Founder of the Empire of the *Mogols*†.

Such was the universal Custom of the ancient World, to make their first Kings and Law-givers Gods or Prophets. And this I take to be the true Reason why we find in *Homer*, the constant Epithets to Kings are ΔΙΟΓΕΝΕΙΣ *born of the Gods*, and ΔΙΟΤΡΕΦΕΙΣ *bred or tutored by the Gods*.

From this general Pretence to Revelation we have enough to conclude of the Sentiments of the ancient Legislators concerning the Use of Religion to the State. For we must always have in Mind what *Diodorus Siculus* so truly observes, *That they did this, not only to beget a Veneration to their Laws, but likewise to establish the Opinion of the Superintendency of*

* Olim quidam magicæ artis imbuti, Thor videlicet and Othinus, obtentis simplicium animis, divinitatis sibi fastigium arrogare cœperunt. — Adco namque fallaciæ eorum effectus percipit, ut in ipsis cæteri quondam numinum potentiam venerantes, eosque deos, vel *deorum complices* autumantes, veneficiorum auctoribus solennia vota dependerent, & errori sacrilego respectum sacris debitum exhiberent. *Saxo-gram.* l. 6. *Hist.*

† Ils ont attribué des Revelations à *Genghizcan*; & pour porter la veneration des peuples aussi loin qu'elle pouvoit aller, ils lui ont donné de la divinité. Ceux qui s'interressoient à son elevation eurent même l'insolence de le faire passer pour fils de Dieu. Sa mere plus modeste, dit seulement qu'il étoit fils du Soleil. Mr. *Petis de la Croix* le pere *Histoire du Genghizcan*, t. 1.

the Gods over human Affairs.^z Nay we shall venture to go farther, and endeavour to shew that this latter was their principal and direct Aim, in all their Pretensions to Inspiration.

The Reader observes, that *Diodorus* does not so much as suspect that these might have a third End, distinct from the two he mentions; namely, the Advancement of their own private Interest. And this with great Judgment. He knew well the Difference between ΝΟΜΟΘΕΤΗΣ and ΤΥΡΑΝΝΟΣ, between a Legislator and a Tyrant. Such Views became not the former; they destroyed his Character, and converted him into his direct Opposite; who applied every Thing to his own particular interest, and this Method amongst the rest. *Aristotle*, in his Maxims for setting up, and establishing a Tyranny, lays this down for one, *To appear to be always extremely attached to the Worship of the Gods, for that Men have the least Suspicion of suffering Injustice from such whom they take to be religious, and believe to have a high Sense of Providence.* Nor will the People be apt to run into Plots and Conspiracies against those, whom they suspect the Gods will, in their turn, fight for, and support,^a And here it is worth observing, that, in Antiquity, Tyrants, as well as Legislators, gave all Encouragement to Religion: And endeavoured to establish their irregular Will, not by persuading Men that there was no Just nor Unjust; but that *their* Quality exempted *them* only from the Observance: Hence may be seen how ridiculous a Scheme of Politics *Hobbes*

^z L. I.

^a "Ετι ὅτι τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς φαίνονται αἰεὶ ἀποδόξοντα διεφθαρμένως, ἥτιόν τε γὰρ φοβῆναι, τὸ παθεῖν τι ἀδύνατον ὑπὸ τῶν τοιούτων, ἐὰν θεοσιδαίμονα νομίζωσιν εἶναι τὸ ἀρχόντα καὶ φοβηθῇ τῶν θεῶν· καὶ ἐπιβουλεύουσιν ἥτιόν, ὡς συμμάχους ἔχοντι καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς. *Polit.*
l. 5. c. 1.

had projected, who, for the very Sake of the Magistrate, was for destroying all Religion. But the Ancients knew better; and so too, did some of the Moderns^b.

The Question then is whether these Pretensions of the Legislators were made for the Sake of the State *immediately*, or for the Sake of Religion; and so, *mediately* only for the other. For it is carefully to be observed, that all, that is in this Discourse represented as contrived and done by the Magistrate in Behalf of Religion, was not done *ultimately* for its own Sake, but for the Sake of the State. The Question, I say, then is, whether this Pretence of Inspiration was made to introduce a *Civil*, or a *Religious* Society. If for the *Civil*, the Effects he would aim at must be *to gain Reception for his Policy and Laws*, or Secondly, *to secure their immutable Duration*. I speak not here of that third Effect, *the procuring a Veneration, and stricter Observance of them from Individuals, during the Course of their Establishment*: And this for very good Reason, because *that* is the very Thing I contend for: such *Veneration and Observance* being only to be procured by the Influence of Religion, which the pretended Inspiration introduces. The Effects then in Question, are *Reception for the Policy and Laws*, or *securing their Immutability*.

1. *To their Introduction and Reception* there could be small Occasion for this Expedient. 1. Civil Laws are seen by every one to be so necessary for the well being of each Individual, that one cannot conceive any need of the Belief of divine Command or Assistance to bring Men to embrace a Scheme

^b Et non à cosa più necessaria à parere d' havere, che questa ultima qualita [religione] perche gli huomini in univèrsale giudicano piu a gli occhi che alle mani, perche tocca a vedere a ciascuno a sentire à pochi. *Machiaval del Principe*, c. 18.

for associating, or to establish the Right they have of so doing. For (as the great Geographer, says) *Man was born with this Inclination to associate. It is an Appetite common both to Greeks and Barbarians: and being by Nature a Civil Animal, he lives readily under one common Policy or Law*. 2. And though it might possibly have happened to a People to be so far sunk into Brutality, as to be backward in their Dispositions to recover a reasonable Nature, like those, with whom it is said *Orpheus* had to deal, *Who being Savages, without the Knowledge of Morality or Law, by recommending to them Piety to the Gods, and teaching them the Ways of Superstition,*^a he reduced into Society; yet this was not the Case of most of those, with whom these Legislators had to do. And therefore if we would assign a Cause of their Pretence to Revelation as extensive as the Fact, it must be that which we contend for. Besides, several of these Legislators gave Laws to a willing People, on the Strength of their Personal Character of Virtue and Wisdom; and called upon to that Office, in which nothing was wanting to beget all necessary Veneration. Again, we find in Fact that where Religion was thoroughly settled, there no Inspiration was pretended to. So both *Draco* and *Solon*, Law-givers of *Athens*, pretermitted it: For they found Religion well secured by the Institutions of *Triptolemus* and *Ion*. And we know, that had pretended Inspiration been only, or principally, for the more easy Introduction and Acceptation of Civil Laws, the sanguinary Laws of *Draco* had stood in

^c Πέφυκε γὰρ ἄνω. Καὶ κοινόν ἐστι τῶν καὶ τοῖς Ἑλλήσι καὶ τοῖς βαρβάραις. Πολίτικοι γὰρ ὄντες, ἀπὸ προδιαγράμματος κοινὸν ζῶσιν. *Strabo Geogr.* l. 16.

^d — Ὅτι θεολαοὶ ὄντες τὰς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ ἔτε ἔβη, ἔτε νόμους εἰδότες, εἰς δεσποδυναμίαν ἀγαγόν, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς αἰσθεῖν ἁρπαγαλίσαν, — *Heracleti de Incred.* c. 23.

more need of the Sanction of a Revelation, than any other of ancient Policy.

Indeed, *Maximus Tyrius* goes so far as to say, that these Legislators prescribed nothing, in their Laws, concerning the Gods, and their Worship^c; which, if true, would make as much against our general Position on the other Hand. But in this, the Sophist is egregiously mistaken. *Porphyrus* quotes an express Law of *Draco's* concerning the Mode of divine Worship. *Let the Gods and our own country Heroes be publicly worshiped, according to the established Rites; when privately, according to each one's Abilities, with Terms of the greatest Regard and Reverence; with the first Fruits of their Labours, and with annual Libations^d.* *Andocides^e* quotes another of *Solon*, which provides for the due and regular Celebration of the *Elusianian Mysteries*. *Athanasius* tells us the same Thing. And how considerable a Part these were of divine Worship, and of what Importance to the very Essence of Religion, we shall see hereafter.

Lastly, Had the Legislators had it only in View to secure the Reception of their Laws, the bare temporary Persuasion of their Intercourse with the Gods would have been sufficient to have brought the People to embrace the Policy offered to them; but we find they perpetuated the Memory of the Divine Assistance; which, sure, could be for no

^c Συνέναι, τί μὲν τὸ δαιμόνιον, πῶς δὲ τιμῆσιν; ἢ γὰρ τῶν κυάμω λαχόντες δικασαὶ χίλιοι ταῦτα ἐξελάσθαι, ἡδὲ Σόλων τι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γεγραφέν, ἡδὲ εἰ Δράκοντος Σεμνοὶ νόμοι. *Differ* 39.

^d Θεὸς τιμᾶν ἢ Ἡρώας ἐγχωρίως ἐν κοινῷ, ἐπομένως νόμοις παλαιοῖς, ἰδίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει. Ὡς ἐν ἡρώα καὶ ἀπαρχαῖς καρπῶν, καὶ πελάγους ἐπελείας. *De abst.* l. 4. § 22. According to the Emendations of *Petit* and *Valentinus*.—The Law is thus introduced Θεομὸς αἰώνιος τοῖς Ἀθηναῖς νεμομένοις, Κύριος τὸ πάντα χερόν.

^e Orat. περὶ Μυστηρίων apud *Decem Orat.*

other End than to establish the Opinion of their Superintendency.

This they did two manner of Ways: The first and general one was, to perpetuate the Memory of it in the Preface of their Institutions, of which we shall speak in the next Section. The other, was to pretend, when the People, to be subdued to Society, were more than usually Savage in their Natures, or barbarous in their Manners; that the extraordinary Intercourse with the Gods was continued and perpetuated. Thus *Strabo*^h tells us, that, even to his Days, every King of the *Getes* had a God for his Privy Counsellor. And in the Histories of *Mexico*, we are told, that the Founders of that Monarchy perpetuated their Relation to the Sun by the Establishment of this extraordinary Custom: That at the Beginning of each Reign the Kings of *Mexico* should make a public and solemn Promise to their People, and compact with them, that the Sun should always rise and set in due Season; that there should be a constant Series of Rain and fair Weather, necessary for the Sowing, Springing, Ripening, and Gathering in their Fruit; and all other Benefits from that Luminary, that Children might be supposed able to obtain from an indulgent Father.

2. As to the perpetuating their Institutions, and rendering them immutable: This entered not into the Intention of the old *Grecian* Legislation; nor, if it had, could it have been obtained by giving them a divine Original. A System of immutable and irrevocable Laws might indeed be the barbarous Project of Eastern Policy; but the *Grecian* Legislators were too well experienced in the Nature of

^h Τῶλο δὲ πὶ ἔθος διέλειπεν ἄχαρ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς, αἰεὶ τινὲς ἐνέλασκο-
μένους τοιαῖα τὸ ἔθος, ὅς τω μὲν βασιλεῖ ἑλμύδαλος ὑπῆρχε, ὡσαύτῃ τοῖς
Γέλοις ἀπομάζετο θεός. 1. 7. Geogr.

Mankind, the Genius of Society, and the ceaseless Vicissitude of human Things, ever to dream of so ridiculous a Design. Besides, the *Egyptian* Legislation, from which they borrowed all their Wisdom of this kind, went upon quite contrary Principles. It directed public Laws to be occasionally accommodated to the Change of Times, Places, and Manners. But had Perpetuity been their aim, the Belief of a divine Imposition would not have served their Purpose. For it never entered the Heads of the People of Antiquity, that Civil Institutions became irrevocable by issuing from the Mouth of a God: or that the Divinity of the Sanction altered the Mutability of their Nature. The Honour of this Discovery is due to certain Moderns, who have found out that divine Authority reduces all its Commands to one and the same Species. A notable Example we have of this in the Conduct of *Lycurgus*. He was the only Exception to this Method of *Grecian* Legislation, and single in the ridiculous Attempt of making his Laws perpetual. For his whole System of Politics being forced and unnaturalⁱ, the Sense of such Imperfection probably, put him upon this Expedient, to tie them on an unwilling People. But did he employ divine Authority to this Purpose? Not in the least: For though he pretended to it, like the rest, and had his Revelations from *Apolló*, yet he well knew that would not be thought sufficient to change the Nature of positive human Laws. And therefore he bound the People by an Oath to observe

ⁱ Il me paróit que *Lycurgue* se écarte toujours un peu trop de la nature dans toutes ses loix — Il faut, ce me semble, craindre les établissemens qui détruisent la nature, sous prétexte de vouloir la perfectionner, says the fine Writer of the *Voyages of Cyrus*, l. 4.

his Policy, till his return from a Voyage, which he had determined beforehand never to accomplish.

Having shewn that there was no need of the Pretence to Revelation, for the Establishment of *Civil Policy*, it follows, that it was made for the *Sake of Religion*.

SECT. III.

THE second Step the Legislators took to inculcate *Religion*, was by making the Doctrine of a Providence, in its full Extent, the grand Sanction of their Laws, with which their Systems of Institutes were prefaced, and introduced. To this Custom *Plutarch*, in his Tract against *Colotes* the Epicurean, refers, where he says, that *Colotes himself praises it; that, in civil Constitutions, the first and most momentous Article is the Belief of the Gods. And so it was that, with Vows, Sacraments, Divinations, and Omens, Lycurgus sanctified the Lacedaemonians, Numa the Romans, ancient Ion the Athenians, and Deucalion all the Greeks in general: And by HOPES and FEARS kept up in them the Awe and Reverence of Religion*^k. On this Practice was formed the Precept of the celebrated *Archytas* the *Pythagorean*^l. Which Sect, as we shall shew hereafter, gave itself up more particularly to Legislation: and from whence proceeded the most famous Founders of Civil Policy. He, in the Fragments of his Work, *de Lege* preserved by *Stobaeus*, delivers himself thus: *The first Law of the Constitution should*

^k — Ἀλλὰ μὲν ἥς γε καὶ Κολωτῆς ἑπαιτὴ διατάξας Ἰνόμεν, πρῶτον ἐστὶν ἡ περὶ θεῶν δοξὰ, καὶ μέγιστον ἡ τῷ Ἀναξερῳ Λακεδαιμονίῃ, καὶ Νουμῷ Ῥωμαίῃ, καὶ Ἰωνὶ ὁ Πρωκλῆς Ἀθηναίῃ, καὶ Δευκαλίῳ Ἑλλήνῃς ὅμῃ τοι πάντας καθύπεσταν, εὐχαίῃ, καὶ ὁρκοῖς, καὶ μαντικαῖς, καὶ φόβῳ, ἐμπρότερον πρὸς τα θεῖα δι' ἑλπίδων ἀμὰ καὶ φόβῳ καθύπεσταν.

^l Legislator to the Tarentines. *Eliau. var. Hist.* l. 3. c. 17.

be for the Support of what relates to the Gods, the Demons, and our Parents, and, in general, of what-soever is good and venerable^m. And in this Manner, if we may credit Antiquity, all their Civil Constitutions were prefaced. Its constant Phrase being, when speaking of a Legislator, διενόσκει ἢ πολιτείαν ὑπὸ Θεῶν ἀρχόμενος. Which Practice I suppose gave Birth to the ancient Proverb, *A Jove Principium*.

The only Things of this Kind now remaining, are the Prefaces to the Laws of *Zaleucus* and *Charondas*, Law-givers of the *Locrians*, and of the *Chalcidic* Cities of *Italy*, and *Sicily*, Contemporaries with *Lycurgus*ⁿ. These, by good Fortune, are preserved by *Diodorus* and *Stobæus*. A great Critic has indeed sometime ago called their Authority in Question; declared them spurious; and adjudged them to be an Imposture of the *Ptolemaic* Age.^o Was it as he pretends, these Fragments would be rather stronger for our Purpose. For, in such Case, we must needs suppose the very learned Sophists, who forged them, copied from the general Practice of Antiquity: And very learned they were, is plain, both from the Excellence of the Composition, and the Age of the pretended Composers. Whereas, if the Fragments be Genuine, they do not so directly prove the *Universality* of the Practice, as the *Antiquity* of it: But, as Truth is what we seek throughout this Work, and *that* seeming to bear hard against our learned Critic's Determination, we must stick by the common Opinion, and examine what hath been offered in Discredit of it.

^m Δεῖ τ' νόμον τὰ πρὸς θεῶν καὶ δαίμονας καὶ γονέας, καὶ ὅλους τὰ καλὰ καὶ τίμια πρὸς αὐτὰ τιθεῖσθαι. *Stob. de Rep. Serm. 41.*

ⁿ *Aristot. pol. 2. 2.*

^o *Dissert. on the Epistles of Phalaris, with an Answer to the Objections of Mr. Boyle.*

The universal Current of Antiquity holds for the Genuineness of these Remains, and for the real Quality of their Authors: *Aristotle, Theophrastus, Tully, Diodorus Siculus, and Plutarch*; the most learned and inquisitive Writers of their several Ages, go quite along with the general Opinion. At length *Timæus* thought fit to deny that *Zaleucus* had given Laws to the *Locrians*; nay, that there ever was such a one in being. We shall be the less surprized at this Paradox when we come to know the Character and Studies of the Man: He was by Profession an Historian, but spent his Time in improving, inventing, and publishing the Faults and Errors of all preceding Writers of Name and Reputation. *Polybius, Strabo, and Diodorus Siculus*, three of the Wisest and most candid Historians of *Greece*, have concurred to draw him in the most odious Colours. The first speaks of him in this Manner^p: *How he came to be placed amongst the principal Writers of History, I know not. — He deserves neither Credit nor Pardon of any one; having so manifestly transgressed all the Rules of Decency and Decorum in his excessive Calumnies, through an innate Malignity of Heart.* This envious, rabid Temper, and perverse turn of Mind, joined to his perpetual Delight in Contradiction, gained him the great Title of *EPITIMÆUS*, the Calumniator. And, which is a certain Mark of a base and abject Mind, he was as excessive in his Flattery as in his Calumny; as where he says, *Timoleon was greater than the greatest Gods*¹. He took so much Pleasure in

^p 'Ουκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἐκφέρεται δόξα, ὡς ἔλκων τὴν ἑ συγγραφίαν
προσασίαν. — Ἐκείνος δ' ἂν σὺν ἑκόντως τευχάνοι συγλήψεως διὰ
πίσεως ἢ ὑδενός, διὰ τὸ προφανὲς ἐν ταῖς λαιδοχαίαις ἐκπολεῖν ἑ
καθήκοντος, διὰ τὸ ἔμφυτον πικρίαν. Excerpt. ex l. 12. Hist.

¹ Suidas in *Timæo*. Τίμαιος ὃ μείζω ποιεῖν Τιμόλεον αἰετὶ ἐπι-
φανέστων Θεῶν.

contradicting the most vulgar Truths, that he wrote a long Treatise, with great Fury and ill Language, to prove that the Bull of *Phalaris* was a mere Fable. And yet *Diodorus* and *Polybius*, who tell us this, tell us likewise, that the very Bull itself was existing in their Time: To all which, he was so little solicitous about Truth, that *Suidas* tells us, he was nicknamed ΓΡΑΟΣΥΛΛΕΚΤΡΙΑ, a *Composer of old Wives Fables*. *Polybius* shews us with what Justice it was given him. — In censuring the Faults of others, he puts on such an Air of Severity and Confidence, as if he himself was exempt from Failings, and stood in no need of Indulgence. Yet are his own Histories stuffed with Dreams and Prodigies, and the most wild and improbable Romances. In short, full of old Wives Wonders, and the lowest and basest Superstition^r. Agreeably to this, *Clemens Alexandrinus* gives him as the very Pattern of a fabulous and Satyric Writer. And he appeared in every Respect of so ill a Character to Mr. Bayle, that that great Critic did not scruple to say, “ Et aparamment il ne fut pas “ mieux fondé quand il nia que *Zaleucus* eût donné “ des Loix à ce Peuple: [les *Locrians*.]” To say all in a Word, he was the CRITICAL HISTORIAN of the *Greeks*; and yet this is the Man Dr. Bentley has thought fit to oppose to all Antiquity with Regard to *Zaleucus*’s Legislation and Existence. It appears to be the more Extraordinary in this learned Critic, because he himself has furnished his Reader with a violent Presumption against *Timæus*’s Authority, where he says^t, that *Polybius* charges him with false Representations relating to the *Locrians*. He adds indeed, that nothing is now extant that shews *Polybius*

^r Οὗτος γὰρ ἐν μὲν ταῖς τῷ πάλας καὶ ἡγεμονίαις πολλὰν ἐπιφάνειαν δεινότητος καὶ τόλμαν ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀπασσιν ἐπιφανῶς καὶ τεράτων καὶ μυθῶν ἀπιθῆναι, καὶ συλλήβδην δεισιδαιμονίας ἀγενεῖς καὶ ταραχίας γυναικάδας ἐστὶ πλήρης. Excerpt. de Virt. & Vit. ex. l. 12.

^t Dissert. upon *Phalaris*, p. 337.

thought *Timæus* mistaken concerning *Zaleucus*. But as *Polybius* quotes a Law as of *Zaleucus*, it seems to be a Proof, in so exact a Writer, that he was well satisfied, that amongst *Timæus*'s Fallhoods concerning the *Locrians*, one was his denying *Zaleucus* to be their Law-giver.

Timæus's Reasons Antiquity has not brought down to us: But the Fragments of *Polybius*^t, preserving an account of his outrageous Treatment of *Aristotle* concerning the Origin of the *Locrians*, make mention of one *Echecrates* a *Locrian*, from whom *Timæus* boasted he had received Information on certain Points in Question. Hence the Doctor, as it would seem, concludes, that amongst the *Locrian*'s Intelligence, he told *Timæus* that he did not believe there was any *Zaleucus*^u. As if, because *Timæus* relied on *Echecrates*'s Information in the Matters in dispute between him and *Aristotle*, therefore *Echecrates* must, of Necessity, support all his Paradoxes concerning that People. But admit it without Proof, that *Echecrates* was of the same Opinion with *Timæus* in this Matter, is he, who, for ought we know, might be as singular and as whimsical in Fact of Contradiction as *Timæus* himself, an Evidence to be opposed to what *Tully* brings; who tells us, that his Clients the *Locrians* had, in his Time, a Tradition of *Zaleucus*'s Legislation^w? And we may well presume that *Tully*, so inquisitive in Matters of Antiquity, as he appears to have been from the curious Story he tells of his Discovery of the Tomb of *Archimedes*, would examine this Matter to the Bottom, and have their Archives searched for that Purpose. And had they contradicted the Tradition, he had surely never brought it in Evidence: But, says Dr. Bentley, if *Echecrates*,

^t Excerpta ex Polybio de Virt. & Vitiis, ex l. 12.

^u P. 336. Dissert. upon Phalaris. ^w De Legibus, l. 2. c. 6.

in that Age, did not believe there was any Zaleucus; he is certainly as credible as Cicero's Locrians, who came so many Generations afterwards, after so many Revolutions and Changes in their Government*. This has no force, because just the Contrary may be concluded from it, that if the Tradition kept its Ground through all those Changes and Revolutions of State, it would seem to have had a very strong Foundation.

The Authority then of *Timæus* against the Existence and Legislation of *Zaleucus* in general is of no weight. Let us next examine what the Doctor has to urge against the Genuineness of those Laws that go under *Zaleucus's* Name. His Arguments are of two Kinds: the one drawn from the Dialect and Use of several Words, which are indeed, later than his Time; the other from *Zaleucus's* being no *Pythagorean*.

1. The Words objected to are these, — *Λεπὶς καὶ παχέας* — *ἰσομύησιν* — *κόρυς* — *Τετραπόδιαις*. This, and the Fragments being written in the common Dialect, instead of the *Doric*, are, in the Doctor's Opinion, sufficient Proofs of the Forgery.

It must be confessed he has employed a deal of good^z Reading, to prove the Words to be all later than the Time of *Zaleucus*.

Let us see then the most that can be made of it. And because it is the best approved, and readiest Method in Criticism, for the Detection of Forgery, and imagined not a little to affect the sacred Writings themselves, we will enquire into the Force of this kind of Argument in general.

It must be owned, that any Thing delivered as the identical Writing of a certain Person, or Age,

* P. 336. *Dissert. upon Phalaris.*

^z From p. 346, to 356 of the *Dissert.*

and having in it Words or Phrases posterior to its Date, carries along with it the infallible Marks of Forgery. A public Instrument, or Diploma, so discredited, is eternally sunk: And to such with great Success was this Canon of Criticism first applied. This encouraged following Critics to try it on Writings of another Kind; and then, for want of a reasonable Distinction, they began to make very wild Work indeed. For though in Writings of abstract Speculation, or of mere Amusement and Entertainment, this Touch might be applied with tolerable Security and Success, there being, for the general, no Occasion, or Temptation to alter the Diction of such, especially in the ancient Languages, that suffered small and slow Change, because one Sort of these Writings was only for the Use of a few learned Men, and, of the other, a great Part of their Curiosity consisted in the original Phrase; yet in practical and public Writings of Law and Religion, the Affair was on another footing: it was the Matter only that was regarded here. And, as this Matter respected the whole Body of the People, it was of the highest Importance that the Words and Phrases should not be obscure, ambiguous, or equivocal: Which would necessitate Alterations in them. On this account, it appears to me, that the Solution the Commentators give to several Difficulties of this Nature occurring in the *Pentateuch*, is founded in good Sense, and fully justified by the Observation here made. The Religion, Law, and History of the *Jews* were incorporated; and it was, in Consequence, the concern of every one to understand the Scriptures. Nor does that superstitious Regard, well known to have been long paid to the Words, and even Letters of Scripture, at all weaken the Force of this Argument: for that Custom arose

only from the Time that the Masoret Doctors fixed the Reading, and added the Vowel Points. Hear a consummate Master in these Matters — *Graviter falluntur qui censent veteres Hebræos semper eandem diligentiam in sacro Codice conservando adhibuisse, aut semper linguæ suæ studio sollicitè incubuisse. Hoc temere nimis a multis retro seculis creditum*². I have taken the Advantage the Subject afforded me to touch upon this Matter, because it is the only Argument, of any Kind of Moment, against the Antiquity of the *Pentateuch*, which I am much concerned in this Treatise to establish.

The Application of all this is very easy to the Case in hand: This Fragment was part of a Body of Laws necessary to be clearly understood by the People; which it could not be, without the Change of Words and Phrases: And to make these an Argument against the Genuineness of the Fragments, would be just as wise as to contend that the first Laws in our vulgar Statute Books, are the Forgeries of later Times, because full of Words unknown to the Ages in which those Laws are pretended to have been enacted.

As to the Change of Dialect, the Doctor thus expresses himself: — *The last Argument I shall offer against the Laws of Zaleucus, is this, that the Preface of them which Stobæus has produced, is written in the common Dialect, whereas, it ought to be in the Doric, for that was the Language of the Locri. — The Laws of Zaleucus therefore are commentitious, because they are not in Doric*³.

What has been said above shews this Argument to have little Force: But it is urged with a particular ill Grace by the learned Doctor, who in the first Edi-

² See the Lord Bishop of Chichester's Preface to the Reader before his Edition of the *Psalms*.

³ P. 355 and 358.

tion of the *Dissertation upon Phalaris* pretends to have discovered, that *Ocellus Lucanus* wrote the *Treatise of the Nature of the Universe* in *Doric*^b. He fully proves that he did so : and from thence rightly concludes, it ought to be acknowledged for a genuine Work, which hitherto learned Men have doubted of from this very Business of its being writ in the common Dialect. For we now see that every Word of the true Book is faithfully preserved ; the *Doric* being only changed into the ordinary Language, at the Fancy of some Copyer^c. Now should he not have seen, by the rash Suspicions of those learned Men in the Case of *Ocellus Lucanus*, that this is a very fallacious Ground of Criticism ? Should he not have concluded if this was done in Books of mere Speculation, it was more likely to have been done in Works so necessary to be well understood as Books of Laws ; especially when we have his own Word for it, that the *Doric* is always clouded with Obscurity^d ?

And on this Account doubtless it was, that transdialecting was no rare Practice. For, besides this Instance of *Ocellus Lucanus*, we have one in *Jamblicus* ; who tells us that the old Poems which went under the Name of *Orpheus*, were written in the *Doric* Dialect. But now the Fragments, which those Ancients, who did not write in *Doric*, have preserved to us, are in the common Dialect. It is very evident then they have been transdialected.

2. We come now to the Doctor's other Argument for the Imposture, which runs thus : — *The Report of Zaleucus being a Pythagorean was gathered from some Passages in the System of Laws ascribed to him, for where else could they meet with it ? So that if it can be proved he was more ancient than*

^b P. 47.^c P. 49.^d P. 517.

Pythagoras, *this false Story of his being a Pythagorean being taken from that System, must convict it of a Cheat*. He then proceeds to prove him more ancient than *Pythagoras*; which he does with great Force of Learning and Reasoning, though his Arguments are not all equally well chose. For instance, where he brings this as a Proof that *Zaleucus* was no Scholar of *Pythagoras*, “Because he ascribed all his Laws to *Minerva*, “from whom he pretended to receive them in “Dreams: which (in the Doctor’s Opinion) has “nothing of a *Pythagorean* in it. For *Pythagoras*’s “Scholars ascribed every thing to their Master: “it was always *ἀντὶς ἑφ’α* with them, *he said it*. “Therefore if *Zaleucus* had been of that Society, he “would certainly have honoured his Master, by “imputing his Laws to his Instructions¹.” But this Argument is of no manner of Weight: For, 1. From what has been said above of the Genius of ancient Legislation, it appears, that universal Practice required, and the Nature of the Thing necessitated the Law-giver to ascribe his Laws to the Inspiration of some God. 2. As to the famous *ἀντὶς ἑφ’α* and its Use in the Schools of Philosophy; it was not peculiar to the *Pythagoreans*, but common to all the Sects of *Greece*, *jurare in verba Magistri*. A device to keep them distinct and separate from each other; and a compendious way of arguing, amongst those of the same School. It would then have been ridiculous to have urged its Authority to any out of the Sect; more so, to the common People; and most of all, to such, upon public and practical Matters; the *ἀντὶς ἑφ’α* being urged only in Points of Speculation and Philosophy. Indeed so unlucky an Argument it is, that,

¹ P. 337.

² P. 338.

on the Contrary, the Reader will, I believe, be apt to conclude, this very Circumstance of *Zaleucus's* ascribing his Laws to *Minerva*, was one of the Things that gave Birth to the Report of his being a *Pythagorean*. And doubtless, it would have much Weight with those who did not carefully enough attend to the Chronological Marks that opposed it. For in this, *Zaleucus* might be supposed to follow both the Precept and Example of *Pythagoras*; he himself pretending to be inspired by *Minerva*: and teaching it as the most efficacious way of establishing Civil Justice, to propagate the Opinion of the Gods having an intimate Intercourse with Mankind².

But notwithstanding the badness of this Argument, the Doctor, as we said, proves his Point with great Clearness, that *Zaleucus* was earlier than *Pythagoras*. And in Conclusion draws the Inference abovementioned, in these Terms: *It was generally reported Zaleucus was a Pythagorean; it is proved he was not. This will refute the Book itself. For if any Intimation was given in the Book that the Author was a Pythagorean; the Imposture is evident. "And yet it is hard to give any other Reason that should induce the later Writers to call him a Pythagorean."* Some Impostor therefore made a System of Laws under the Name of *Zaleucus*, and in it gave a broad Hint that he was a Scholar of *Pythagoras*.

Here he rests his Cause. If then it be not hard to give another Reason, that should induce the later Writers to call him a *Pythagorean*, his long Dissertation to prove *Zaleucus* the earlier of the two, is of no manner of Use, to the Proof of the Imposture. I have already hinted at a very probable one, which was his having the same inspiring Goddess with

² See Jamblicus's *Life of Pythagoras*.

Pythagoras. And this will be much strengthened by this farther remarkable Consideration, that *Minerva* became the peculiar Patroness of the *Pythagorean* Legislators, on Account of the Assistance she had given to their Master. To which, we may add, the Laws being in *Doric* (and supposing them genuine, they certainly were so) for this Idiom was peculiar to the *Pythagoric* School^h. And farther, that the whole Proem of *Zaleucus's* Laws

^h This we are told by *Jamblicus*, His Words are, λέγειν τῶν, ὡς φωνῇ χρῆσθαι τῇ πατρίᾳ ἐκείνοις παρήγγελον. *Vit. Pyth.* 194. *Kust. Ed.* Dr. Bentley understands them to signify that every one should use his own Mother Tongue. And indeed, without reading the Context one could scarce avoid giving this Sense to them. *Vizzanius*, — that every one should use the Mother Tongue of *Crotona*; which was the *Doric*. Of these, the Doctor says, which is the true, perhaps all competent Readers will not be of one Mind, p. 386. But I believe there will be no great Diversity of Opinions amongst those who weigh the following Reasons: 1. *Jamblicus* adds, τὸ δὲ ξένισεν οὐκ ἐδοκιμαζον; by which I understand him to mean that the *Pythagoric* Sect did not approve of a foreign Dialect. For if it was meant of the particular *Greeks* that entered into it, it has no Sense or Meaning in this Place. But now a Sect's not approving of a foreign Dialect, must suppose they had one natural and peculiar to it. 2. *Jamblicus* in the same Place tells us that *Pythagoras* valued the *Doric* above the other *Greek* Dialects, as the most agreeable to the Laws of Harmony. Τὴν δὲ Δωρίαν διάλεκτον ἐναρμόνιον εἶναι. Now he having made the Essence of the Soul Harmony, it was no Wonder he should chuse a Dialect, which he supposed approached nearest to its Nature; that the Mind and Tongue might go together. 3. *Pythagoras* seems here to have affected imitating his Master *Orpheus*, from whom, as we shall see hereafter, he borrowed much of his Philosophy. For *Jamblicus* tells us, that the old Writings that went under the Name of *Orpheus*, were composed in *Doric*. 4. But, Lastly, a Passage in *Porphyrus's* Life of *Pythagoras* seems alone sufficient to determine this Matter: *Jamblicus* giving the Causes of the Decay of the *Pythagoric* Philosophy, assigns this for one, that their Commentaries were written in *Doric*. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὸ καὶ τὰ γεγραμμένα Δωρίδι γέγραπται, p. 49, *Kust. Ed.* than which nothing can be a clearer Comment on the Words in Question, to determine them to the Sense we contend for.

was

was formed agreeably to the Precepts of *Pythagoras* in this Matter; who directs, that, next after the Worship of the Gods; *Dæmon*, and Parent-worship should be enjoinedⁱ. And later Writers, seeing these two visible Marks of a *Pythagorean*, might, without farther Consideration, reasonably be disposed to think *Zaleucus* of that Sect. But as the learned Doctor has made out from sure Chronological Evidence, that this was a Mistake, we must seek some other Cause of the Uniformity. Which I take to be this: *Zaleucus* was in the highest Repute in *Greece* for Legislation in the Time of *Pythagoras*; which might incline that Philosopher to imitate him, both in his inspiring Goddess, and in the Proem of his Laws. So that Posterity was only mistaken in which was the Copy, and which the Original. This they might very well be; for *Pythagoras*, and his Sect, had engrossed all the Fame in the Fact of Legislation: Which leads me to another probable Cause of the common Opinion of *Zaleucus's* being a *Pythagorean*. The Character of this Sect we say, and shall prove hereafter, was so great for Law-giving, that after Ages thought nothing could be done to Purpose, in that Way, which had not a *Pythagorean* for its Author. So, besides *Zaleucus*, the Ancients supposed *Charondas*, *Numa*^k, *Zamolxis*^l, *Phytius*, *Theocles*, *Elicaon*, *Aristocrates*, nay the very *Druids*^m, Legislators of *Gaul*, and in a Word all the eminent Legislators that lived any thing near the

ⁱ Μετὰ τὸ θεῖόν τε καὶ τὸ δαίμόνιον, πλείστον ποιεῖσθαι λόγον γονέων. *Jamb. Vit. Pyth.* c. 30.

^k Quinetiam arbitror propter *Pythagoreorum* admirationem, Numam quoque Regem *Pythagoreum* à posterioribus existimatum, *Tul. Tusc. disp.* l. 4. c. 1.

^l *Herod.* l. 4.

^m *Ammian. Marcell.* l. 15. c. 9.

Time of *Pythagoras*, to be instructed by him. And this Notion not only sprung from his great Character and Reputation, but was likewise nursed up and improved by the *Pythagoreans* themselves, to beget honour to their Master; as we may see in *Jamblicus's* Life of that Philosopher. So that was there no more in it than this, as *Zaleucus's* Institutions were in great Repute, we might very naturally account for the Mistake.

But Lastly, it is indeed very true, that, as the Doctor suspected, the principal Ground of the Report of *Zaleucus* being a Pythagorean, was gathered from some Passages in the System of Laws ascribed to him. He is only too hasty in his Conclusion that therefore this must convict the System of a Cheat. What led him to it is his supposing that no such Report could be gathered from Passages in the System, but such as must be an Intimation that the Author was a Pythagorean: And that there is no Difference between giving and taking an Intimation. If then this Report might be gathered from Passages that contained no Intimation, and if the Reader may understand that to be an Intimation which the Writer never intended for one; then will the Credit of these Remains continue unshaken, though we grant the Doctor his whole Premises, and all the Facts he contends for.

It is certain then, a principal Ground of the Report was gathered from a Passage in his System of Laws. And I believe I have found what that was. *Zaleucus* in his Preface speaks of an evil Genius or Demon, ΔΑΙΜΩΝ ΚΑΚΟΣ, as influencing Men to wickedness. This though a Notion of the highest Antiquity, whose Origin and Author are much

^u Ἀριστοτέλης δ' ἐν πρώτῳ περὶ φιλοσοφίας, καὶ πρεσβυτέρους εἶναι [Μαγιστῶν] ἡ Διγυγία, καὶ δύνανται αὐτὰ εἶναι ἀρχαί, ἀγαθὰ δαίμονα.

much disputed of, yet was the distinguishing Doctrine of the *Pythagoreans*. *Plutarch* speaking of *Pythagoras's* Opinion of the first Principle, says, that that Philosopher called, τὴν μονάδα Θεὸν τὴν ἡ δυνάδα, δαίμονα. Which Δυνάς the *Pythagoreans* used extremely to vilifie and revile as the Cause of all Evil. The Application of this Doctrine I suppose *Pythagoras* might borrow from *Zaleucus*, and here again Posterity be mistaken as to the original Author. But we may collect from the same *Plutarch*, that this Opinion was cultivated by all the ancient Legislators. For he who favoured the Notion of two Principles, the one Good, and the other Evil, affects, I observe, to draw every ancient Writer, that but mentions an evil Dæmon, into his Sect. In his Treatise of *Isis* and *Osiris*, he speaks to this Purpose, — “ That it was a most ancient
“ Opinion delivered as well by LEGISLATORS as
“ Divines, that the World was neither made by
“ Chance, neither did one Cause govern all things,
“ without Opposition.”

This Notion therefore, delivered in the Proem of *Zaleucus's* Laws, might very well be understood as an *Intimation of the Author's being a Pythagorean*, and yet, not being so designed by the Author, it tends not, in the least, to refute the Book itself.

The other Arguments, against these Laws, and those of *Charondas*, are such slender Things, that, after the Confutation of what is urged above, they will not be able to bear their own Weight.

δαίμονα, καὶ κακὸν δαίμονα. *Diog. Laer. Vit. Phil. Proem. Seg. 8.*
Οὐκ οἶδα μὴ τὸ ΠΑΝΥ ΠΑΛΑΙΩΝ τὸ ἀτοπώτατον ἀναγκασθῶ-
μεν προσδέχεσθαι λόγον ὡς τὰ φαῦλα δαίμονια καὶ βλάσκαν, προσ-
φθοῦντα τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνθρώποις. — *Plutarch. vita Dionis.*

Διὸ καὶ παμπάλαιος αὕτη κᾶττις ἐκ Θεολόγων καὶ ΝΟΜΟ-
ΘΕΤΩΝ — ὡς ἔστ' ἄνεν καὶ ἄλογον καὶ ἀκυσόεργον αἰσχροῖαι
τῶ ἀνθρώπων τὸ πᾶν, ἔτε εἰς ἐς ὁ κρατὶν καὶ κατ' ἐσθύνων, ὥσπερ
δαίμων ἢ τις πειθηρὶς χαλινῶς λόγος.

On the whole then, I presume, it appears that the Credit of these Remains stands unshaken for any thing the learned Doctor has advanced to the contrary, and that we may safely urge them as of the Antiquity they pretend to.

Thus *Zaleucus* begins his Preface : — “ Every
“ Inhabitant, whether of Town or Country, should
“ first of all be firmly persuaded of the Being and
“ Existence of the Gods : which Belief he will be
“ readily induced to entertain, when he contem-
“ plates the Heavens, regards the World, and ob-
“ serves the Disposition, Order, and Harmony of
“ the Universe ; which can neither be the Work
“ of blind Chance, or of Man. These Gods are
“ to be worshiped as the Cause of all the real
“ Good we enjoy. Every one therefore should so
“ prepare, and possess his Mind, as to be free
“ from every Kind of Pollution ; being persuaded
“ that God is not honoured by a wicked Person,
“ nor acceptably served with sumptuous Ceremo-
“ nies, or taken with costly Sacrifices, like a mi-
“ serable Man ; but with Virtue only, and a con-
“ stant Disposition to good and just Actions. On
“ which account, . . . Every one ought to labour all
“ he can to become good, both in Practice and
“ Principle, whereby he will render himself dear
“ and acceptable to God : . . . Ought to fear more
“ what leads to Ignominy and Dishonour, than to
“ Loss of Wealth and Fortune ; and to esteem him
“ the worthiest Citizen, who gives up his world-
“ ly Goods, rather than renounce his Honesty
“ and Love of Justice : . . . But those whose Ap-
“ petites are so headstrong as not to suffer them
“ to be persuaded to these Things, and whose
“ Minds are turned with a natural Bias towards
“ Evil, whether they be Men or Women, Citizens
“ or Sojourners, should remember the Gods ; and
“ think

“ think upon their Nature, and of the Judgments
 “ they always have in store, to inflict upon wicked
 “ Men : They should *set before themselves the dread-
 “ ful Hour of Death*, a Period they must all arrive
 “ at ; *when the Memory of evil Actions past will*
 “ *seize every Sinner with Remorse, accompanied with*
 “ *the fruitless Wish of having submitted his Actions to*
 “ *the Rules of Justice*. Every one therefore should
 “ so watch over his Behaviour, *as if that Hour was*
 “ *still present with him*, and attended all his Mo-
 “ tions : which is the way to keep up in himself
 “ an exact regard to Right and Justice. BUT IF
 “ THE WICKED DEMON ATTEMPTS TO INFLU-
 “ ENCE HIM TO EVIL, let him fly to the Altars
 “ and Temples of the Gods, as the surest Asylum
 “ from Injustice ; Injustice, whom he should re-
 “ gard as the cruelest and wickedest of Tyrants ;
 “ and implore their Assistance to drive her far from
 “ him. To this end, let him likewise have re-
 “ course to those, whose Reputations are high for
 “ Probity and Virtue ; whom he may hear dis-
 “ course of the Happiness of Good, and the Ven-
 “ geance attending Evil Men^P.”

It

P Τῆς κατοικεῖν τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν, πάντας πρῶτον πεπεῖσθαι
 χρῆν, καὶ νομίζειν θεὸς εἶναι, καὶ ἀναβλέποντας εἰς ἄραρον, ὃ τὸν κόσμον,
 καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀγαθὸν καὶ κακόν· ὃ γὰρ τύχης, ἐξ ἁνθρώπων
 εἶναι δημιουργήματα· σέβας δὲ τῷ θεῷ καὶ τιμῶν, ὡς αἰτίας ὄντας ἀπαρτίζων
 ἡμῖν· ἀγαθῶν, τὰ κατὰ λόγον γινόμενων. ἕκαστον ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ ἀποσκευάζειν
 δεῖ τὴν αὐτῆς ψυχὴν, πάντων τῶν κακῶν καθαρῶν· ὡς ὃ τιμὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἴστω
 ἁνθρώπου φαῦλε, ἐξ ὧν θεοσβόλῃ δαπανᾷται, ἐξ ὧν τραγωδίας τὸ αἰσχρὸν
 κομίζεται, καθάπερ μοχθηροῦ ἁνθρώπου· ἀλλ’ ἀρετῇ καὶ προαίρεσει τὰ
 καλὰ ἔργα εἰς δίκαιον. διὸ ἕκαστον δεῖ εἰς διώσκειν ἀγαθὸν εἶναι καὶ
 πρᾶξι καὶ προαίρεσει τὸ μέλλοντα εἶσεσθαι θεοφιλή· καὶ μὴ φοβέσθαι τὰς
 εἰς χεῖράμας ζημίας μάλλον τῶν εἰς αἰχμῶν τεινόντων· καὶ πολὺν αἰεί-
 ρονα ὀνομάζειν τὸ τὸ εὖ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν μακάριον· καλὸν καὶ δίκαιον. ὅσοις δὲ
 μὴ ἐκείνους πρὸς ταῦτα τὸ ὅριον πεπεῖσθαι, τὸ δὲ ψυχὴν ἔχουσαν δόκνησιν
 πρὸς ἀδικίαν ὡς ἡμῖν παρεγγέλθω· πᾶσι οἷς τοιαύτοις πολιταῖς, καὶ
 πολὺ ἐστὶ ὁ θυνοῖς μεμνησθαι θεῶν ὡς οἴων, καὶ δίκας ἐπιτεμπούσιν
 τοῖς ἀδικοῖς· καὶ τίσεσθαι πρὸς ὁμμάτων τὸ κατὰ τὸν νόμον, ἐν ᾧ γινεῖται τὸ
 ΤΕΛΟΣ

It is indeed surprizing, that any Man who had attentively considered this admirable Remain, should think it the Forgery of a Sophist. The Author of it plainly understood human Nature and Society at another sort of rate. He has not only given us an exact Pourtrait of natural Religion pure and unsophisticated; but, in applying it to the Service of the State, has explained the Use and Subserviency of its Parts, to the three great Classes of Mankind, which make up the Body of all Communities. He has recommended the intrinsic Excellence of Virtue, and Obedience to the Will and Example of the Gods, to those who are of so ingenuous and well-framed a Nature, as to be always disposed to embrace Truth and Right: To others, of a less heroic turn of Mind, who idolize Reputation, he holds out Honour and Ignominy, as the inseparable Attendants of good and evil Actions: And, to the common run of more intractable and perverse Spirits, he preaches up the Doctrine of future Rewards and Punishments. I will only observe, that it appears to have been from hence, that *Pomponatius* borrowed the beautiful Passage, which we have quoted at large, in the first Book of this Treatise.

Thus *Zaleucus*: and much in the same fashion does *Charondas* introduce his Laws.

In imitation of this Practice, *Plato* likewise, and

τελευτῶν ἐκάστην τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν ἢ ζῆν, σᾶσι γὰρ ἐμπέπει μελαμίλεια τοῖς μέλλουσιν τελευτᾶν, μνηστῆρας αὐτῶν δικήκασιν, καὶ ὁρμὴν δὲ βεβήλας πάντας πεποσφῆσαι δικαίως αὐτοῖς. διὸ δὲ ἐκάστη παρ' ἐκάστην πράξιν αἰεὶ συνοικεῖν τὸ κοινὸν τῶν, ὡς ἡ παρ' ἡμῶν ἔστω γὰρ ἂν μάλιστα ἢ καλῶς καὶ δίκαιος φρονεῖν. ἔαν δὲ τῷ ἀδίκῳ ΔΑΙΜΩΝ ΚΑΚΟΣ τρέψαν πρὸς ἀδικίαν, ἀφαιρῇ πρὸς καὶς καὶ βωμοῖς ὅ τι μίνεσι, φόβου δὲ τὴν ἀδικίαν, ὡς δέσποιναν ἀσέβειάτην καὶ χαλεπωτάτην, ἐκείνου δὲ τὰς θύας σιωποῖ ἵππειν αὐτῷ. ἔαν δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἀνδρας δόξαν ἔχοντας ἰπ' ἀδελφῶν ἀκασόμην ὡς αὐτοῖς βίη, καὶ κακῶν ἀνδρῶν τιμωρίας, ἵνα ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀδικίας ἐξέλθω. Apud Stobæum, Sermon. 42.

Cicero,

Cicero both preface their Laws with the Sanctions of Religion: And though these two great Men were not, strictly speaking, Legislators in form; yet we are not to fancy, that what they wrote, in this way, was like the Dreams of the Sophists, for the Entertainment of the idle and imaginative. They were both well practised in the public, and deeply conversant in human Nature; and they formed their Institutes altogether on the Plan, and in the Spirit and Views of ancient Legislation: The Foundation of *Plato's* Laws being the *Attic Institutes*; and of *Cicero's*, the *twelve Tables*: who himself takes care to warn us of this difference: —

“ In Imitation (says he) of *Plato*, the most learned,
 “ and, at the same time, the wisest of the Philo-
 “ sophers, who wrote *best*^a of a Republic, and
 “ likewise, separately, of the Laws thereof, I think
 “ it will be proper, before I give the Law itself,
 to

^a I read here, with *Turnebus*, *qui princeps de Rep. conscripsit*. *Lambin* objects to this reading, because we gather from *Aristotle*, that *Plato was not the first that wrote of a Republic*; he supposing the Words required that Sense: whereas they signify, *who wrote best of a Republic*, as we have translated them; and as *Turnebus*, without question, understood them. That this was *Tully's* Opinion of *Plato*, may be gathered from many Places in his Writings.

^r Ut priusquam ipsam legem recitem, de ejus legis laude dicam. This Passage is not without its Difficulty. If by *LEX* is meant the whole System of Laws that follows, which the tenour of the Discourse leads one to conclude; then, by *LAUS*, the Recommendation of it, we are to understand the shewing, as he does in the following Chapter, that the Gods interessed themselves very much in the Observance or Inobservance of Civil Laws: which implies that they were indeed their Laws: And so *Tully* calls them, in the 4th Ch. of this Book: *Ita principem legem illam, & ultimam, mentem esse dicebant omnia, ratione aut cogentis, aut vetantis Dei; ex qua illa Lex quam Dii humano generi dederunt, rectè est LAUDATA*. And the shewing that Civil Laws came originally from the Gods, was the highest Commendation of them. — But: if by *LEX* we are to understand only the first Law

“ to say somewhat in recommendation of it: which
 “ I observe, was the Method of *Zaleucus* and *Charondas*. For their Systems of Laws was not an
 “ Exercise of Wit, or designed for the Amusement of idle, speculative Men, but composed
 “ for the Use of their Fellow Citizens, in the Administration of the Republic. *These Plato imitated*;
 “ as thinking this likewise to be the Business of Law; to gain somewhat of its End
 “ by the gentler Methods of Persuasion, and not
 “ to carry every thing by Force and Fear of Punishment^f.”

Here, we see, he intimates, that *Plato* and himself had the same Views in writing Laws with *Zaleucus* and *Charondas*; namely, the Benefit of their Fellow Citizens. The Difference between them was, that the two Originals were employed by their Country; and the two Copiests generously undertook an Office they were not called to.

On all accounts, these two latter are the greatest Authorities Antiquity can supply us with, and the most deserving to be heard in this Matter. But, to shorten, all we can, the Drudgery of quoting; as *Cicero* professes to borrow from *Plato*, speaks his Sentiments, and often in his Words, we shall content ourselves in citing the *Roman* only, as

of the System, which begins, *Ad Divos adeunto caste*, &c. then by *Recommendation* is meant shewing, as he does likewise in the following Chapter, the Use and Service of Religion to Civil Society.

^f Sed, ut vir doctissimus fecit *Plato*, atque idem gravissimus philosophorum omnium, qui princeps de republica conscripsit, idemque separatim de legibus ejus, id mihi credo esse faciendum; ut priusquam ipsam Legem recitem, de ejus legis laude dicam. Quod idem & *Zaleucum* & *Charondam* fecisse video; cum quidem illi non studii & delectationis, sed reipublicæ causâ leges civitatibus suis scripserunt. Quos imitatus *Plato*, videlicet hoc quoque Legis putavit esse, persuadere aliquid, non omnia vi ac minis cogere. *De Leg. l. 2. c. 6.*

abundantly sufficient to shew the Opinion of them both.

Cicero's Introduction to his Laws, is as follows:

— “ Let our Citizen then be first of all firmly
 “ persuaded of the Government and Dominion of
 “ the Gods ; that they are the Lords and Masters
 “ of the Universe ; that all things are directed by
 “ their Power, Disposal, and Providence ; and that
 “ the whole Race of Mankind is in the highest
 “ manner indebted to them ; that they are inti-
 “ mately acquainted with every one's State and
 “ Condition ; that they know what he does, what
 “ he thinks ; with what Disposition of Mind, with
 “ what Degree of Piety he performs the Acts and
 “ Offices of Religion ; and that, accordingly, they
 “ make a Distinction between good and evil Men.
 “ The Mind being imbued with these Opinions,
 “ will never deviate, in its Determinations, from
 “ Truth and Utility. And what is more certain,
 “ than that no one ought to be so stupidly arro-
 “ gant, as to suppose there is Mind and Reason
 “ in himself, and none in the Heavens and the
 “ World ; or that those things which can scarce
 “ be comprehended with the utmost stretch of hu-
 “ man Genius, perform their Motions without an
 “ understanding Director ? But him, whom the
 “ Courses of the heavenly Bodies, the Vicissitudes
 “ of Day and Night, the orderly Temperature of
 “ the Seasons, and the various Blessings the Earth
 “ pours out for our Subsistence and our Pleasure,
 “ will not excite, will not compel to Gratitude ;
 “ is it fit such a one should be so much as reckoned
 “ in the Number of Mankind ? And since all
 “ things that are endowed with Reason, are more
 “ excellent than those which are devoid of it, and
 “ that it is Impiety to say, any *particular* is more
 “ excellent than the *universal* Nature ; we must

“needs confess this Nature to be endowed with
 “Reason. That these Opinions are likewise use-
 “ful, who can deny, when he considers what Sta-
 “bility is derived to the Public from within, by
 “the Religion of an Oath ; and what Security it
 “enjoys from without, by the holy Rites which
 “accompany national Leagues and Treaties? how
 “efficacious the Fear of divine Punishment is to
 “deter Men from Wickedness? and how venera-
 “ble and august that Society must needs esteem
 “itself, where the immortal Gods themselves are
 “believed to interpose both as Judges and Wit-
 “nesses? Here you have the Proem of the Law :
 “for so *Plato* calls it.”

And then follow the Laws themselves ; the first
 of which is conceived in these Words : — *Let those
 who approach the Gods, be pure and undefiled ; be their
 Offerings seasoned with Piety, and all Ostentation of*

* Sit igitur hoc a principio persuasum civibus, dominos esse
 omnium rerum ac moderatores Deos, eaque quæ gerantur, eorum
 geri vi, ditione, ac numine, eisdemque optime de genere homi-
 num mereri ; & qualis quisque sit, quid agat, quid in se admittat,
 qua mente, qua pietate colat religiones, intueri ; piorumque &
 impiorum habere rationem. His enim rebus imbutæ mentes,
 haud sane abhorrebunt ab utili, & a vera sententia. Quid est
 enim verius, quam neminem esse oportere tam stulte arrogantem,
 ut in se rationem & mentem putet inesse, in cœlo mundoque non
 putet ? aut ut ea, quæ vix summa ingenii ratione comprehendat,
 nulla ratione moveri putet ? Quem vero astrorum ordines, quem
 dierum noctiumque vicissitudines, quem mensium temperatio,
 quemque ea, quæ gignuntur nobis ad fruendum, non gratum esse
 cogant ; hunc hominem omnino numerare qui decet ? Cumque
 omnia, quæ rationem habent, præstent iis, quæ sint rationis ex-
 pertia, nefasque sit dicere, ullam rem præstare naturæ omnium
 rerum ; rationem inesse in ea, consistendum est. Utiles esse au-
 tem opiniones has, quis neget, cum intelligat, quàm multa fir-
 mentur jurejurando, quântæ salutis sint fœderum religiones ? quàm
 multos divini supplicii metus a scelere revocarit ? quamque sancta
 sit societas civium inter ipsos, Diis immortalibus interpositis tum
 iudiciis tum testibus ? Habes legis Proœmium ; sic enim hoc
 appellat *Plato*. *De Leg.* l. 2. c. 7.

Pomp

Pomp omitted : The God himself will be his own Avenger upon them who do otherwise. Let the Gods, and those who have always been esteemed in the Number of Celestials, be worshiped : and those likewise whom their Merits have raised to Heaven ; as Hercules, Bacchus, Æsculapius, Castor, Pollux, and Romulus. And to those Qualities, by whose Aid Mortals arrive thither, such as Reason, Virtue, Piety, good Faith, let there be Chapels erected, wherein to celebrate their Praises."

S E C T. IV.

THE next Step the Legislator took, was to affirm and establish the general Doctrine of a Providence, which he had delivered in his Laws, by a very particular, and popular Method of inculcating the belief of a future State of Rewards and Punishments.

This was by the Invention of the MYSTERIES, the most sacred Part of Pagan Religion ; and framed to strike most forcibly and deep into the Minds and Imaginations of the People.

To this End and Purpose were *religious Mysteries* instituted : which, because it is a thing little known or attended to, the Ancients who wrote expressly on the Mysteries, such as *Melanthius, Menander, Hicestius, Sotades*, and others, not being come down to us, I hold it not beside our Purpose to give as full, and as distinct an Account of the whole Matter, as the Nature of the present Work will allow. The Writers on this part of Pagan Worship, are

" Ad Divos adeunto castè ; pietatem adhibento, opes amovento : qui secus faxit, Deus ipse vindex erit. — Divos, & eos qui cœlestes semper habiti, colunto ; & ollos, quos endo cœlo merita vocaverint, Herculem, Liberum, Æsculapium, Castorem, Pollucem, Quirinum. Ast olla, propter quæ datur homini adscensus in cœlum, mentem, virtutem, pietatem, fidem, earumque laudum delubra sunt. *De Leg. l. 2. c. 8.*

altogether in the dark concerning the Original and Progress of it; not excepting *Meursius* himself, whom yet I am much indebted to, for abridging my Labour, in searching through Antiquity for all the Passages that make mention of the *Eleusinian Mysteries*, and for bringing the greatest Part of them together under one View^w.

To avoid Ambiguity, we shall first explain the Term. Each of the Gods of Paganism had, besides the public and open Worship paid to them, a *secret Worship*; into which none were admitted but those who had been selected by preparatory Ceremonies, called *Initiation*. This *secret Worship* was termed the MYSTERIES: But though every God had, besides his open Worship, the *secret* likewise; yet this latter was not paid to him in all Places where the former was; but only there, where he was the Patron God, or in principal Esteem. Thus, when in consequence of that intercommunity of Paganism, which will be explained hereafter, one Nation adopted the Gods of another, they did not always take in, at the same time, the secret Worship or Mysteries of that God: So in *Rome* the public and open Worship of *Bacchus* was in use long before his Mysteries were admitted. But on the other hand again, the Worship of the strange God was sometimes introduced only for the sake of his Mysteries: As in the same place were *Isis* and *Osiris*. Thus stood the Case in general; the particular Exceptions to it will be seen in the sequel of this Section.

The first and original *Mysteries*, of which we have any Account, were those of *Isis* and *Osiris* in EGYPT; from whence they were derived to the *Greeks*^x, under the Presidency of various

^w Eleusinia: five de Ceteris Eleusina sacra:

^x *Diod. Sic. lib. 1.*

Gods^r, as the Institutor thought most for his purpose: *Zoroaster* brought them into *Persia*; *Cadmus* and *Inachus* into *Greece* at large²; *Orpheus* into *Thrace*; *Melampus* to *Argis*; *Trophonius* into *Bæotia*; *Minos* into *Crete*; *Cinyras* into *Cyprus*; and *Erechtheus* to *Athens*. And as in *Egypt* they were to *Isis* and *Osiris*; so in *Asia* they were to *Mithras*; in *Samothrace* to the Mother of the Gods; in *Bæotia* to *Bacchus*; in *Cyprus* to *Venus*; in *Crete* to *Jupiter*; in *Athens* to *Ceres* and *Proserpine*; in *Amphissa* to *Castor* and *Pollux*; in *Lemnus* to *Vulcan*: and so to others, in other Places.

The Nature and End of these were all the same, to teach the Doctrine of a future State. This the two most learned Writers of Antiquity, of different Parties agree in, *Origen* and *Celsus*: The first, minding his Adversary of the Difference between the future Life Christianity promises, and that taught in Paganism; bids him compare the Christian with what all the Sects of Philosophy, and all the Mysteries, amongst *Greeks* and *Barbarians*, taught²: And *Celsus*, in his turn, endeavouring to shew that Christianity had no advantage over Paganism, by the Efficacy of stronger Sanctions, addresses those he writes against, in this manner: *But now, after all, just as you believe eternal Punishments, so do the*

ὅτι ὅτι καὶ τῶν Διονυσίων, καὶ τῶν Παναθηναίων, καὶ μέντοι καὶ τῶν Θεσμοφορίων, καὶ τῶν Ἑλευσινίων τὰς τελετὰς Ὀσφύου, ἀντὶς Ὀδρύσης, εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐκόντισεν, καὶ εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀφικόμενος, τὰ τῶν Ἰσίδου καὶ τῶν Ὀσίριδος εἰς τὰ τῶν Διῶς καὶ τῶν Διονύσου μετατίθεικεν ὅρλια. *Theodoretus Therapeut. 1.*

² Ἐκείθεν δὲ ἀρχὴν ἔχει τὰ παρ' Ἑλλήσι μυστήρια τε καὶ τελεταὶ πρὸς τερσιν παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ Θραξί, καὶ Φοινίξ, καὶ Βαβυλωνίοις, κακῶς ἐπινοησάμενα, μελενεχθέντα τε εἰς Ἑλλάδας ἀπὸ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων χάρις ὑπὸ Κρόνου καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν Ἰνάρχων. *Eriphan. adv. Hæc. lib. 1.*

² — Καθ' ἑκάστην φιλοσόφων αἵρεσιν ἐν Ἑλλήσιν ἢ Βαβυλώσις ἢ ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΩΔΗ. *Orig. cont. Celsum, 1. 3. p. 160. Sp. Ed.*

Ministers of the sacred Rites, and those who initiate into, and preside in the Mysteries^b. They continued long in Religious Observance: some were more celebrated and extensive, and others less so; to which many accidental Causes contributed: *Euripides* makes *Bacchus* say in his Tragedy of that Name^c, That the *Orgies* were celebrated by all Nations, and that he came to introduce them amongst the *Greeks*. And it is not improbable that several barbarous Nations had learnt them of the *Egyptians* long before they came into *Greece*. The *Druids* of *Britain*, who had, as well as the *Brachmans* of *India*, their Religion from thence, celebrated the *Orgies* of *Bacchus*, as we learn from *Dionysius the African*. But, of all the Mysteries, those which bore that Name by way of Eminence, the *ELEUSINIAN*, celebrated at *Athens* in Honour of *Ceres*, were by far the most famed; and in process of time absorbed, and as it were swallowed up all the rest. Their Neighbours all around them very early practised these Mysteries to a Neglect of their own: In a little time all *Greece* and *Asia Minor* were initiated into them: And at length they spread over the whole *Roman Empire*, and even beyond the Limits of it. So *Tully*: *Omitto Eleusinam sanctam illam & augustam; ubi initiantur gentes orarum ultimæ*^d. And we are told in *Zosimus*, that these most holy Rites were then so extensive,

^b Μάλιστα μὲν, ὃ βέλαις, ὥσπερ σὺ κολάσεις αἰώνιους νομίζεις· ἔτω καὶ οἱ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐκείνων ἐξελθῆναι τελευταί τε καὶ μυσαγωγῶσι. l. 8. p. 408. And that nothing absurd was taught in the Mysteries concerning a future State, I collect from the Answer *Origen* makes to *Celsus*, who had preferred what was taught in the Mysteries of *Bacchus*, on that Point, to what the Christian Religion revealed concerning it. — ὥστε μὲν ἐν τῷ Βακχικῶν τελευτῶν ἢ τις ἐστὶν πικρὸς λόγος, ἢ τις μηδὲν τοιοῦτον — l. 4. p. 167.

^c Act. 2.

^d Nat. Deor. lib. 1.

as to take in the whole Race of Mankind^e: And *Aristides* calls it the common Temple of the Earth^f.

How this came to pass, is to be accounted for from the Nature of the State, which gave Birth to these Mysteries. *Athens* was a City the most devoted to Religion of any upon the Face of the Earth. On this Account, their Poet *Sophocles*, calls it, *the sacred Building of the Gods*^g. Nor was it a less Compliment, St. *Paul* intended to pay them when he said Ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ πάντα ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστεροὶς ὑμῶν θεωρῶ^h. Hence *Athens* became the Standard in Matters of Religion to the rest of the World.

In Discourfing then of the Mysteries in general, we must be forced to take our Ideas of them, chiefly from what we find practised in these. Nor need we fear to be mistaken, the End of all being the same, and all having one common Original, namely *Egypt*.

To begin then with the Purpose and Design of their Institution. This will be seen, by shewing what was taught in the Mysteries promiscuously to all.

To support the Doctrine of a Providence, which they taught presided over the Universeⁱ, they inculcated, by all kind of Methods, as we shall see hereafter, the Belief of a future State of Rewards and Punishments^k. But as this did not quite clear

^e Τὰ συνέχοντα τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος ἀγιώτατα μυστήρια. l. 4.

^f Ὅστις ἔκ κοινόν τι τῇ γῆς τίμενος τῇ ἑλευσίῃ ἡγήτο. *Aristides Eleusiniā*.

^g *Electra*, Act. 2. § 1. ΑΘΗΝΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΘΕΟΔΑΜΗΤΩΝ.—

^h Act. Apost. c. xvii. § 22.

ⁱ *Plutarch de Is. & Osir.*

^k [Mysteriis] neque solum, &c. — Sed etiam cum spe meliore moriendi. *Tul. de Leg.* l. 2. c. 24.

up the mysterious Ways of Providence, they added, to it the Doctrine of the Metempsychosis, or the Belief of a *prior State*: As we learn from *Tully*, and *Porphyry*¹, who informs us that it was taught in the Mysteries of the *Persian* Mythras. This was an ingenious Solution, invented by the *Egyptian* Legislators, to remove all doubts concerning the moral Attributes of God^m; and so consequently, firmly to establish the Belief of his Providence from a future State.

For the Legislator well knew how precarious that Belief was, while the moral Attributes of God were doubted of. Accordingly *Proclus* on the first of *Plato's* Rep. represents the Mysteries, as supporting the Doctrine of a Providence on this footing. — Ἐξωθεῖν ᾗ τὸ ἀέριον ἢ τὸ σολεινόν, τὰ τελευμένων τῷ φωτὶ τῶ Θεῶν.

In inculcating the Doctrine of a future State, it was taught, that the *Initiated* should be happier than all other Mortals in that State: that while the Souls of the Profane, at their leaving the Body, stuck fast in Mire and Filth, and remained in Darkness, the Souls of the *Initiated* winged their Flight directly to the happy Islands, and the Habitations of the Godsⁿ. This Promise was necessary for the Support of the Mysteries, as the Mysteries were for the Support of the Doctrine. But now

¹ Καὶ γὰρ δόγμα πάντων ἐστὶ τὸ πρῶτον, τὸ ΜΕΤΕΜΨΥΧΩΣΙΝ ἔσθ. ὃ καὶ ἐμφαίνεται εὐκλαστικῶς ἐν τοῖς ἑσθ. Μιθραϊκοῖς. *De Abst.* l. 4. § 16.

^m So *Tully* Ex quibus humanæ vitæ erroribus & ærumnis fit, ut interdum veteres illi sive vates, sive in sacris INITIISQUE tradendis divinæ mentis interpretes, qui nos ob aliqua scelera suscepta in vitâ, superiore pœnarum luendarum causa, natos esse dixerunt, aliquid vidisse videantur.

ⁿ *Plato Phædone* — *Aristides Eleusiniâ* & apud *Stobæum*, Serm. 119, &c. *Schol. Arist. Ranis.* *Diog. Laert. in vita Cog. Cyxici.*

lest it should be mistaken, that Initiation alone, or any other Means than a virtuous Life, intitled to this future Happiness; they perpetually inculcated, that it was the chief Business of the Mysteries to restore the Soul to its original Purity. So Plato: *It was the End and Drift of Initiation to restore the Soul to that State, from whence it fell as from its native Seat of Perfection*^o. They made every thing tend to shew the Necessity of Virtue, as appears from *Epictetus*. Thus, says he, *the Mysteries become useful: thus we seize the true Spirit of them. For every thing therein was instituted by the Ancients, for Instruction and Amendment of Life*^p. Porphyry gives us some of those moral Precepts that were inculcated in the Mysteries, as, *to honour their Parents, to offer up Fruits to the Gods, and to forbear Cruelty towards Animals*^q. In pursuance of this Scheme, it was required in the Aspirant to the Mysteries that he should be of an unblemished and virtuous Character, and free even from the Suspicion of any notorious Crime^r. For the Discovery of which he was severely interrogated by the *Mystagogue*^s. On this account *Suetonius* tells us, that when *Nero*, after the Murder of his Mother, took a Journey into Greece,

^o Σκοπὸς τῶν τελείων ἐστίν, εἰς τέλος ἀναλαβεῖν τὰς ψυχὰς ἐκείνην ἀπ' ἧς τὸ πρῶτον ἐποίησαντο καθαροί, ὡς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. *Phaedone*.

^p Οὕτως ἀφ' ἑλπίμα γίνεται τὰ μυστήρια· ὥτως εἰς φαντασίαν ἐρχόμεθα. ὅτι ἐπὶ παιδείᾳ καὶ ἱπποκοσίᾳ καὶ βίᾳ κατεστάθη πάντα ταῦτα ὑπὸ τῶν παλαιῶν. *Apud Arrian. Dissert. 1. 3. c. 21.* The Reason of my translating εἰς φαντασίαν, in the Manner I have done, was, because I imagined the Author in this obscure Expression; alluded to the Custom, in the Mysteries, of calling those who were initiated only in the lesser, *Μύται*; but those who had the whole Secret in the greater, *Ἐπόπται*.

^q Γενεῖς τιμαὶ. Θεῶς καρποὺς ἀγάλλειν. Ζῶα μὴ σίνεσθαι. *De Abst. 1. 4. § 22.*

^r Οὗτοι γὰρ τὰ ἄλλα καθαροὶ εἶναι τοῖς μύταις ἐν κοινῇ παρασέθενται, αἶον τὰς χεῖρας, τὴν ψυχὴν, &c. *Libanius Decl. 19.*

^s *Plutarch in Apophr. & Laconicis.*

and had a Mind to be present at the Celebration of the *Eleusinian* Mysteries, the Conscience of his Parricide deterred him from it^t. So the good Emperor *M. Antoninus*, when he would purge himself to the World of the Death of *Avidius Cassius*, chose to be initiated into the *Eleusinian* Mysteries^u: It being notorious to all, that none were admitted to their Participation, who laboured under the just Suspicion of any heinous Immorality. The Initiated were enjoined, during the Celebration of the Mysteries, the greatest Purity, and highest Elevation of Mind. *When you sacrifice or pray*, says *Epictetus* in *Arrian*, *go with a prepared Purity of Mind, and with Dispositions so previously disposed, as are required of you when you approach the ancient Rites and Mysteries*^w. *It was not lawful*, says *Tully*, *so much as to indulge the Imprudence of the Eye in these Mysteries*^x. And *Proclus* tells us that the Mysteries and Initiations drew the Souls of Men from a material, sensual, and merely human Life, and joined them in Communion with the Gods^y. Nor was a less Degree of exactness required in the future Conduct of the Initiated^z. They were obliged by solemn Engagements to commence a new Life of the strictest Purity and Virtue: on which Account,

^t Peregrinatione quidem, *Græciæ, Eleusiniis* sacris, quorum initiatione impii & scelerati voce præconis submoverentur, interesse non ausus est. *Vita Neron. c. 34.*

^u *Jul. Capit. vitâ Ant. Phil. and Dion. Cass.*

^w Καὶ μετὰ θυσίας ἥ, καὶ μετὰ δόχων, καὶ προηγουμένη, καὶ προδιακείμενοι τῇ γνώμῃ, ὅτι ἱερωῆς προσελύσειαι καὶ ἱερωῆς παλαιῶς. *Arrian. Differt. l. 3. c. 21.*

^x Quò ne imprudentiam quidem oculorum adjici fas est. *De Leg. l. 2. c. 24.*

^y Τὰ τε μυστήρια καὶ τὰς τελείας ἀνάγειν μὴ ἀπὸ τῆ ἐνύλης καὶ θνητοειδούς ζωῆς τὰς ψυχὰς, καὶ συνάπτειν τοῖς θεοῖς. *In Remph. Plat. l. 1.*

^z Καὶ τῶ μυστηρίων ἀξιώσεως ἰδιόμην καὶ τῶ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀείσης παιδείσεως. *Quidam apud Sopatrum in div. quæst.*

Ini-

Initiation was called TEΛETH as supposing it the Means of Perfection^a. The Consideration of all this made *Tertullian* say, that in the Mysteries, *omnia adversus veritatem, de ipsa veritate constructa esse*^b. And *Austin*, *Diabolus animas deceptas illulasque præcipitasse, quum polliceretur purgationem animæ per eas, quas TEΛΕΤΑΣ appellant*^c.

The Initiated under this Discipline, and with these Promises, were esteemed the only happy Men. *Aristophanes* who speaks the Sense of the People, makes them exult after this Manner: *On us only does the Orb of Day shine benignant, we only receive Pleasure from its Beams: we who are initiated, and perform towards Citizens and Strangers all Acts of Piety and Justice*^d. And the longer any one was initiated, the more Honourable he was held^e. It was even esteemed scandalous not to be initiated: and how virtuous soever the Person otherwise appeared, he became Suspicious to the People: As *Socrates*, and in after Times *Demonax*, as we see in *Lucian's* Life of his Friend. No wonder then, if the superior Advantages of the Initiated, both here and hereafter, should make the Mysteries universally aspired to. And this was indeed the Fact: For they soon grew as extensive in the Numbers of all Ranks and Conditions they embraced, as in the Regions and Countries to which they pene-

^a Καὶ τελετὰς ἐκάλουν, ὡς τελεῖσθαι, καὶ εἰς τὸ τέλος ἀγύσθαι τὰς τελεθμύχας. *Maximus Monach. in Epist. ad Demoph.* 8.

^b *Apol.* c. 47. ^c *De Trinitate*, l. 3. c. 10.

^d Μόνοις γὰρ ἡμῖν Ἥλιος
καὶ φέγγος ἰλαρὸν ἐστίν,
ὅσοι μεμνήμεθ', ἀ-
σιεῖν τε διήγομεν
τῶντων, οὗ τε ξένους
καὶ τὰς ιδιώτας.

Chorus Raris, Act. 1.

^e Καὶ ὁ μὲν ἀρετὴν καὶ μύστις ἀτιμότερος τῶν πάλαι μύστων. *Aristides in Orat.* οὗτε οὐδ' ἀφ' ὧν γινώσκονται.

trated. Men, Women, and Children were initiated therein. Thus *Apuleius*^f describes the State of the Mysteries in his Time. “Influunt turbæ, sacris
“divinis initiatæ, viri fœminæque, omnis ætatis et
“omnis dignitatis.” The *Pagans* would seem, indeed, as if they thought Initiation as necessary as the *Christians* did Baptism^g. And the Custom of initiating Children appears to have been general from this Passage of *Terence*^h.

“Ferietur alio munere ubi Hera pepererit;
“Porro autem alio, ubi erit puero natalis dies;
“Ubi INITIABUNT.

Nay they had even the same Kind of Superstition with Regard thereto, that some *Christians* had concerning Baptism, namely to defer it to the Approach of Death; as appears from the honest Farmer *Trygæus* in the *Pax* of *Aristophanes*.

Δεῖ γὰρ μυθεῖναι, πρὶν τελευτῆναι.

The Reason of all this is given us by the Scholiast on the *Ranæ* of the same Poet. — *It was believed by the Athenians, that he who was initiated, and instructed in the Mysteries, should obtain divine Honours after death: And THEREFORE all ran to be initiated*ⁱ. And their Fondness for it was so great, that at such Times as the public Treasury was low, Admittance into these Mysteries could be made a Fund of. *Aristogiton*, says the Commentator on *Hermogenes*, in a great Scarcity of public Money, brought

^f *Met.* l. 11.

^g This appears from the following Lines of *Sophocles*.

— Τοῖς ᾧ γὰρ μόνος ἐκεῖ

Ζῆν' ἔστι. τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις πάντ' ἐκεῖ κακὰ.

^h *Phorm.* *Act.* 1. § 1.

ⁱ Λόγος γὰρ ἐκράτει παρ' Ἀθηναίων, ὡς ὁ τὰ μυστήρια διδασκόμενος, μετὰ τ' ἐνθάδε τελευτῇ θείᾳ; ἔξισ' οὐ τιμῆς διὸ καὶ πάντες, πρὶν τ' μύσειν ἑαυτοὺς δοῦναι.

a Law, that in Athens every one should pay a certain Sum for his Initiation^k.

Every Thing in these Rites was transacted in Mystery, and under the most religious Seal of Secrecy^l. Which how it could agree, and was best fitted to our Representations of these Mysteries, as an Institution of the State, for the Use of the People, we shall now endeavour to shew.

They were hidden and kept secret for these two Reasons: 1. Nothing stimulates Man's Curiosity like that which retires from his Observation, and seems to forbid his search. Of this Opinion was the great Synesius where he says: *The People will despise what is easy and intelligible, and therefore they must always be provided with something wonderful and mysterious in Religion, to hit their Taste, and engage their Curiosity^m*. And again, *the Ignorance of the Mysteries preserves their Veneration; for which Reason, they are entrusted to the Cover of Nightⁿ*. On this Principle the Mysteries were framed. They were kept secret, to excite the Curiosity: They were celebrated in the Night, to impress Veneration and

^k Ἀειρογείτων ἐν πᾶσι χερμάτων, γράφει νόμοι, παρ' Ἀθηναίων μινδ' ἔμυσθαι. *Syrianus*.

^l Cum incognitis hominibus *Orpheus* sacrorum ceremonias aperiret, nihil aliud ab his quos initiabat in primo vestibulo ac unius jurisjurandi necessitatem, & cum terribili auctoritate religionis exegit, ne prophanis auribus inventæ ac compositæ religiones proderentur. *Firmicus in limine* l. 6. *Astrol.* — Nota sunt hæc *Græcæ* superstitionis hierophantis, quibus inviolabili lege interdictum erat, ne hæc atque hujusmodi Mystéria apud eos, qui his sacris minime initiati essent, evulgarent. — *Nicetas in Gregoriz Nazianzeni Orat.* εἰς τὰ ἅγια φῶτα.

^m Τὸ ὃ ῥᾶσι καταχεράσειαι ὁ δῆμος δέεται ἡ περιλείας. To the same Purpose, *Nicephorus Gregoras Hist.* l. 5. τὰ ἡδ τοῖς πᾶσι παρέχεται κόρον τε ἔχει, καὶ ἀχρηστία σφίσι ὡς τὰ πολλὰ ἀεικύνεται.

ⁿ Ἀγνωσία σεμνότης ἐς τὰ τελεῶν καὶ νύξ τῆτο πιστεύεται τὰ μυστήρια. *Libro de Providentia*.

religious Horror°. And they were performed with Variety of Shews and Representations, of which more hereafter, to infix and perpetuate those Impressions^p. Hitherto then the Mysteries are to be considered as invented, not to deter, but to invite the Curiosity of the People. But,

2. There was a Necessity of teaching some things to the Initiated, not expedient for others to know. The learned *Varro* in a Fragment of his Book of Religions, preserved by *St. Austin*, tells us, that “There were many Truths, which it was not advantageous to the State to be generally known; “and many things, which, though False, it was expedient the People should believe; and that “therefore the *Greeks* shut up their MYSTERIES “in the Silence of their sacred Inclosures^q.”

Now to reconcile this seeming Contradiction, of supposing the Mysteries to be instituted to invite the People into them, and at the same Time, to keep them from the People’s Knowledge, we are to observe there were in the *Eleusinian Rites* two Mysteries, the greater and the less^r. To the *less* must be referred what we said of the Institutor’s Intention to invite the People into them; and to the *greater*, his Intention of keeping some Truths from the People’s Knowledge. Nor is this said

° *Euripides* in the *Bacchantes*, *Act* 2. makes *Bacchus* say that the *Orgies* were celebrated in the Night, because Darkneſs has something solemn and august in it, and proper to fill the Mind with sacred Horror.

P Τα μυστήρια ἐν ΑΛΛΗΓΟΡΙΑΙΣ λέγεσθαι, πρὸς ἑκταλῆν καὶ φεῖκην, ὥστε ἐν ΣΚΟΤΩ, καὶ ΝΥΚΤΙ. *Demet. Phalereus de Elocutione*, §. 110.

^q Multa esse vera, quæ vulgo scire non sit utile; multaque, quæ, tametsi falsa sint, aliter exillimare expediat. Et ideo *Græcos* TELETAS & MYSTERIA taciturnitate parietibusque clausisse, &c. *Civ. Dei* l. 4. c. 31.

^r Ἦσαν τὰ μὲν μέγιστα τῷ Δέμῳ τῶν τὰ δὲ μικρὰ Περσεφόνῃς τῇ αὐτῇ θυγατρὶ. *Interp. Græc. ad. Plut. Aristophanis.*

without

without Authority: Antiquity is very exprefs for this Distinction. We are told that the *lesser* Myſteries were only a Kind of Preparation for the *greater*^r. And that the uſual Time of Probation was five Years^r. And *Clemens Alex.* expreſſly informs us that theſe Secrets were lodged^r in the greater Myſteries.

However it is very certain that both the greater, and leſſer Myſteries were inſtituted for the Service of the State: it follows, that the Doctrines taught in both, were for the Uſe and Benefit of Society; only with this Difference, ſome might, without Inconvenience, be taught promiſcuouſly, others not.

On the whole then of this Matter, it appears, as will be fully confirmed hereafter, that the Secret in the *lesser* Myſteries was ſome hidden Rites and Shews to be kept from the People, only to invite their Curioſity; and that the Secret in the *greater*, beſides that, was ſome hidden Doctrines to be kept from the People for the contrary Purpoſe.

But it will be worth while, as it is a Thing of Moment, to enquire more particularly into the hidden Doctrines of the greater Myſteries. It ſeems yet to lie altogether in the dark, ſo religiously was the Secret kept. We ſhall therefore proceed cautiously, and try, from the obſcure Hints dropped up and down in Antiquity,

“ Pandere res alta terra & caligine merſas.

^r “Εἰσι τὰ μικρὰ ὡς περ ποικίλας, καὶ προαγνύουσιν τὰ μεγάλων.
Schol. ad Plut. ſecund. Ariſtoph.

^r — Cūm epoptas ante quinquennium inſtituunt, ut opinionem ſuſpendio cognitionis ædificent. *Tertull. Adverſus Valentinianos.*

^r Μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ εἰσι τὰ μικρὰ μυθήματα, διδασκαλίας τινὰ κατέχουσιν ἔχοντα, καὶ προπροαγνύουσιν τὰ μεγάλων τὰ δὲ μεγάλα αὐτὰ συμπαίλων εἰ μανθάνειν ἔτι καὶ οὐκ ἐπιτελείται, ἐποπτεύουσιν δὲ, καὶ ἀεινοῦσιν τὰ φύσιν, καὶ τὰ πνεύματα. *Sitom. 5.*

L

We

We shall first consider their general Nature: It appears they must needs be such, as if promiscuously taught, would bring Prejudice to the State; why else were they secreted? and, at the same Time, Benefit, if with Caution and Prudence communicated; why else were they taught at all?

This was their general Nature, and from this we may come,

I. To the certain Knowledge of what they were not; which is a Step to the Knowledge of what they were.

1. They were not the general Doctrines of a Providence and future State; for these Reasons: — Ancient Testimony is most express, that these general Doctrines were taught promiscuously to all the Initiated, and were the very Essence of mysterious Rites. — These were not capable of being hid and secreted, because they were the universal Doctrines of Mankind in Society. — There was no need to hide them; because the public Knowledge of them was so far from being detrimental, that Society, as we have shewn, could not even subsist without their being universally known and believed.

2. These secret Doctrines could not be the metaphysical Speculations of the Philosophers concerning the Deity, and the human Soul. Because this would be making the *hidden Doctrines* of the Schools of Philosophy, and of the Mysteries of Religion, all one; which they could not be, because their Ends were different: *That* of the first being only Truth; *that* of the other, Utility. — Because revealing such metaphysical Speculations to the Members of Civil Society, as such, with what Precaution soever, would be injurious to the State, and productive of no possible good; as we shall see when we come, in the third Book, to examine
 1 what

what those metaphysical Speculations were. — Because those very Speculations, as we shall then see, would overthrow every thing taught to all, in the Mysteries, of a Providence and a future State. And yet we are told by the Ancients, that the Doctrines of a Providence, and future State, were the Foundation of the more secret ones, which we are now enquiring after. I have been the more particular in overthrowing this Notion, that the secret Doctrines of the Schools, and of the Mysteries might be the same; because I find it to be an Error, that some, even of the most knowing of the Ancients, were apt to run into. What misled them were, — That the Schools, and Mysteries both pretended to the same End; namely, *to restore the Soul to its original Purity and Perfection*. We have seen how much the Mysteries did so. As to the Philosophers, *Porphyry*, speaking of *Pythagoras*, tells us, that he professed Philosophy, whose End is to free and vindicate the Soul from those Chains and Confinements, to which its Abode with us hath subjected it. — That the Schools and Mysteries had each their hidden Doctrines, that went under the common Name of *ἈΠ'Ο'Ρ'ΡΗΤΑ*; and that, which had a common Name, was understood to have a common Nature. — But chiefly that the Philosopher and Legislator, being frequently in one and the same Person, and consequently the Institutions of the Mysteries, and Schools by the same Hand, it appeared reasonable to think, that the *ἀπόρρητα*, in both, were the same. They not distinguishing the two-fold Character of the ancient Sage, as shall be explained in its Place.

Ἡ φιλοσοφία δ' ἐφιλοσώρησεν, καὶ ὁ σκοπὸς, ῥύσασθαι καὶ διαλύ-
θεῖν τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν τοιούτων εἰργῶν τε καὶ συνδέσμων τῶν κατὰ κεχωρισμένον
ἥμιν ἔστι. *De Vita Pythagoræ.*

II. From the Knowledge of what these Secrets were not, deduced from the general Knowledge of what they were, we shall at length arrive to the Discovery of the Doctrines themselves.

We shall begin with a Passage of *Clemens Alex.* — *After these [namely Lustrations] are the lesser Mysteries, in which is laid the Foundation of the hidden Doctrines, and Preparations for what is to come afterwards^u.* From a Knowledge of the Foundation, we may be able to form a Plan of the Superstructure. This Foundation, as hath been fully shewn, was the Belief of a Providence, and future State, and its Consequence on Practice, Engagements to a virtuous Life. But there was one insuperable Obstacle in Paganism to a Life of Purity and Holiness; which was, the vicious Examples of their Gods. *Ego homuncio hoc non facerem^w?* was the absolving Formulary, whenever a Man had determined to give a Loose to his irregular Appetites. Now the Mysteries professed not to exact any thing difficult of the Initiated, without assisting him in the Performance of his Obligations^x. There was a Necessity then of remedying this evil: which

^u Μετὰ ταῦτα δέ εἰσι τὰ μικρὰ μυστήρια, διδασκαλίας τινὲς ὑπόθεσιν ἔχοντα, καὶ προπαρασκευάζοντα τὸ μελλόντων. *Strom.* 5.

^w Terence *Eun.* Act 3. S. 5. — Euripides puts this Argument into the Mouth of several of his Speakers, up and down his Tragedies. *Helen*, in the 4th Act of *the Trojan Dames*, says, *How could I resist a Goddess, whom Jupiter himself obeys.* *Ion*, in his Play of that Name, in the latter End of the 1st Act, speaks to the same Purpose: And in the 5th Act of *Hercules Furens*, *Theseus* consoles his Friend by the Examples of the Crimes of the Gods.

^x Ἀλλ' ἴσονται ἂν καὶ τελείην πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν ἰτοιμότατος. *Sopat.* in *Div. Quæst.* Καθάπερ ἄλλω μυστηρίῳ προστελεσθεὶς τῇ σιωπῇ, καὶ ἄλλων ἀμαρτημάτων λοιπὸν τ' ἐμμελὲς βίον ἐκάθαιρετο καὶ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον τ' ὁδὸν τελείην ἐπειγόμενος, ἐκκλινεν τ' ἀμαρτημάτων ἰσχυράζον. *Sopat. ibidem.*

was done by striking at the Root of it. So that, such of the Initiated, as were judged capable, were made acquainted with the whole Delusion. The *My-
stagogue* taught them, that *Jupiter, Mercury, Venus, Mars*, and the whole Rabble of licentious Deities, were indeed only dead Mortals, subject, in Life, to the same Passions and Vices with themselves; but having been, on several accounts, Benefactors to Mankind, grateful Posterity had deified them; and, with their Virtues, had indiscreetly canonized their Vices. The fabulous Gods being thus routed, the supreme Cause of all things, of Course, took their Place. Him, they were taught to consider as the Creator of the Universe, who pervaded all things by his Virtue, and governed all by his Providence. From this Time the Initiated had the Title of *Ἐπόπτης*, by which was meant *one that sees Things as they are without Disguise*; whereas before he was called *Μύσος*, which has a contrary Signification.

Thus we see, how what was taught and required in the *lesser Mysteries*, became the Foundation of Instruction in the *greater*: The Obligation to a good Life in *those*, made it necessary to remove the Errors of Polytheism in *these*; and the Doctrine of a Providence taught *there*, facilitated the Reception of the one Cause of all things *here*.

These were the Truths that *Varro*, as quoted above, tells us it was not expedient for the State, should be generally known: imagining the Error of Polytheism to be so inveterate, as not to be expelled, without throwing the Society into Convulsions. But *Plato* spoke out: he owned *the true Notion of God could not be entrusted to the Multitude*. And in another place, that *it is difficult to find the*

y Apud *Joseph. contra Ap.* l. 2.

Father and Creator of the Universe; and when found, as impossible to discover him to all the World².

Besides, there was another Reason why the Institutions of the Mysteries, who, as we shall shew, were Legislators, should be for keeping this Truth secret. They had had, as we have shewn, the greatest Stroke in the Rise of Polytheism. They contrived it for the sake of the State; and to keep the People in awe, under a greater Veneration for their Laws. This Polytheism the Poets had much depraved, by inventing or recording vicious Stories of the Gods and Heroes; that the Legislators would have stifled. And they were only these Stories, that in their Opinion, made Polytheism hurtful to the State, as may be seen in Plato.

That this Account of the *ἀπὸρρητα*, in the greater Mysteries, is no precarious Conjecture, formed, merely in my own Imagination, I shall now endeavour to shew.

The *Egyptian* Mystagogues in their secret Rites, taught the Unity of the Godhead, as is made very evident by the great *Cudworth*². Now it has been proved, that the *Grecian*, and *Asiatic* Mysteries were borrowed from these; so that here is a strong Presumption of the Fact. But to bring it more directly home: *Chrysippus*, as quoted by the Author of the *Etymol. Magnum*, speaks to this Purpose: “ And *Chrysippus* says, that the secret Doctrines concerning divine Matters, are rightly called *Τελετή*; for that these ought to be the last things the Initiated should be instructed in: the Soul thereby gaining an able Support; and being possessed of her Desires, can keep silent before the Uninitiated and Profane. For it is a great Prerogative to be admitted to those Lectures,

¹ In *Timæa*.

² *Intel. System*. c. 4. § 18.

“ wherein

“ wherein are delivered just and right Notions
 “ concerning the Gods, and which teach Men to
 “ comprehend their Natures^b.” To the same Pur-
 pose *Clemens*: “ The Doctrines delivered in the
 “ the great Mysteries, are concerning the Universe.
 “ Here ends all Instruction; things are seen as
 “ they are; and Nature, and the Things of Na-
 “ ture, are given to be comprehended^c.” And
Pythagoras himself, as we find him quoted in *Jam-
 blicus*, tells us, that in the *Thracian* Mysteries of
Orpheus, he was instructed in the Unity of the first
 Cause; which in his obscure *Pythagoric* Way he
 thus expresses: — *That the eternal Substance of Num-
 ber was the Principle, most providential, of the Uni-
 verse, of Heaven, and Earth, and of the middle Na-
 tures*^d. But *Cicero* fully reveals the whole Mystery;
 and confirms every thing we have said concerning
 it^e. — “ But what? is not almost all Heaven (not

^b Χρύσιππος ὃ φησὶ, τὰς περὶ τῶν θεῶν λόγους εἰκότως καλεῖσθαι
 τελείας· χρεῖναι γὰρ τὰς τελούσας, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι διδάσκεισθαι
 τὴν ψυχῆς ἐχούσης ἔργα, καὶ κεκαρτημένους, καὶ παρὰ τὰς ἀμύνης
 συμπᾶν δυνάμεις· μέγα γὰρ εἶναι τὸ αἶθρον, ὑπὲρ θείων ἀκῶσαι τε ὁρᾶν,
 καὶ ἐνκαρτῆς γενέσθαι αὐτῶν. *Etymol. Author in Τελείῃ.*

^c Ταῖς Μεγάλας περὶ τῶν συμπαντίων ἐμμανάνειν ἔτι ὑπολείπεται,
 ἐποπτεύειν ὃ καὶ περινοεῖν τὴν φύσιν καὶ τὰ πρᾶγματα. *Strom.* 5.

^d Ἀριθμῶν ὅστιον αἰθῶν ἢ ἢ μὴ ἀρχάν, πραγματεύσασιν τῷ παντί·
 ὁρατῶ καὶ γὰρ, καὶ τὰς μετὰ φύσιν. *De vita Pyth.* § 146.

^e From this Passage *Mr. Le Clerc* saw so far, as to conclude,
 that the Secret in the *Eleusian* Mysteries, was the Teaching
 the true History of *Ceres* and her Daughter. On y apprenoit la
 verité de l'histoire de *Dio & Pherephatta*, qui passoient pour des
 Deesses du premier ordre, n'avoient été que des mortelles. *Bibl.*
Univer. Tom. 6. p. 79. And so *Mr. Banier*, after him: Le
 secret y étoit surtout extrêmement recommandé, non pas pour en
 cacher les abominations; mais, comme le pretend *Mr. Le*
Clerc apres *Meursius* & quelques Anciens, parce qu'on decouv-
 roit aux Initiez la veritable histoire de *Ceres*, & de sa fille, &
 qu'il étoit important de cacher au public, de peur que venant
 à scavoir que ces deux pretendues Deesses n'avoient été que
 deux femmes mortelles, leur culte ne devint méprisable. *Expl.*
Hist. des Fables, Tom. 2. *Entret.* 8.

“ to carry on this Detail any farther) filled with
 “ the human Race? But if I should attempt to
 “ examine Antiquity, and from those Things
 “ which the *Grecian* Writers have delivered, search
 “ to the Bottom of this Affair; it would be found,
 “ that even those very Gods themselves, who are
 “ esteemed the *Dii majorum gentium*, had their Ori-
 “ ginal here below; and took their Flight from
 “ hence into Heaven. Enquire whose Sepulchres
 “ those are, which are so commonly shewn in *Greece*.
 “ REMEMBER, for you are initiated, WHAT YOU
 “ HAVE BEEN TAUGHT IN THE MYSTERIES;
 “ THEN YOU WILL, AT LENGTH, UNDERSTAND
 “ HOW FAR THIS MATTER MAY BE CARRIED^f.”
 This explains a Passage to the same Purpose in
Proclus, where he says, *in the Celebration of the My-*
steries it is said, that the Initiated meet many things of
multiform Shapes, and Species, that presfigure the first
GENERATION of the Gods^g. But Tully goes far-
 ther, he tells us in another place, that not only
 the *Eleusinian* Mysteries, but likewise the *Samo-*
thracian, and the *Lemnian*, taught the Error of
 Polytheism, agreeable to our Hypothesis; which
 supposes all the Mysteries derived from the same
 Original, and constituted for the same End. —
 “ Quid? qui aut fortes, aut claros, aut potentes viros
 “ tradunt post mortem ad deos pervenisse, eosque esse

^f Quid? totum propè cœlum, ne plures persequar, nonne hu-
 mano genere completum est? Si vero scrutari vetera, & ex his
 ea, quæ Scriptores *Græciæ* prodiderunt, eruere coner; ipsi illi,
 majorum gentium Dii qui habentur, hinc a nobis profecti in
 cœlum reperientur. Quære, quorum demonstrantur sepulcra in
Græcia: REMINISCERE, QUONIAM ES INITIATUS, QUÆ
 TRADANTUR MYSTERIIS; TUM DENIQUE QUAM HOC
 LATE PATEAT, INTELLIGES. *Tusc. Disp. l. i. c. 12, 13.*

^g Ἐν ταῖς ἑτελεύταις ἀγιογραφαῖς φασί, τὰς μύσας ἔχειν πρῶτον
 πολυεῖδους καὶ πολυμόρφους ἃ δεινὰ προδείλνυσι καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπαίσχυν-
 ται. *In Plat. Theol. l. i. c. 2.*

“ ipsos,

“ ipfos, quos nos colere, precari, venerarique sole-
 “ amus. — Ab Euhemero & *mortes & ſepultura*
 “ *demonſtrantur deorum.* Omitto *Eleuſinē* ſanctam
 “ illam & auguſtam. — *Prætereo Samothraciam,*
 “ eaque,

“ *Quæ Lemni*
 “ *Nocturno aditu occulta coluntur*
 “ *Silveſtribus ſæpibus denſa^h.*

Plutarch ſpeaks much to the ſame Purpoſe, where cenſuring the ſtrange Stories the Dramatic Poets told of the Gods, he ſays, *they ſeemed to do it as if induſtriouſly to oppoſe what was taught and done in the moſt holy Myſteriesⁱ.*

Thus, I think I have made it evident, that the *ὑπόρρηλα* in the greater Myſteries were the Doctrine of the Unity and Detection of Polytheiſm^k.

Nay, I will venture to go farther : And if I ſhould ſay I could give the Reader the very Hymn that was ſung on this Occaſion by the Myſtagogue, who it is remarkable was habited like the Creator^l.

^h *De Nat. Deor.* l. i. c. 42.

ⁱ Καὶ ταῦτα ποιητὰς καὶ λογιγράφους ἐν θεάτεροις ἀγωνιζομένους λέγειν ἰώντες, ὡς ἐπὶ ἐπίτηδες ἀντιμαχευεῖσθαι τῶν δὲ θεῶν ἱεροῖς τοῖς ἀγῶσι τοῖς. *De Oracul. Defectu.*

^k What hath been ſaid will give Light to an odd Story, that the Ancients tell of a mad Freak of *Alcibiades* and his Companions, in a Night Ramble, juſt before his *Syracuſian Expedition.* *Plutarch* and others, tell us, that he acted over with, and revealed to his Companions the Myſteries of *Ceres* ; and that he broke all the Statues of *Hermes.* Theſe are ſpoke of as diſtinct Actions, that had no relation to one another : But now we ſee their Connexion, and how one was the Conſequence of the other : For having revealed the Secret of the Unity, and the Original of Polytheiſm to his Friends ; nothing was more natural, than for Men heated with Wine, to run out in a Kind of religious Fury, and break the Statues of the Gods.

^l Ἐν ᾧ τοῖς κατ' ἑλδουσίᾳ μυſτηρίοις, ὁ μὲν ἱεροφάντης εἰς εἰκόνα θεοῦ δημιουργοῦ ἐκποδύζεſται. *Euseb. præp. Ev.* l. 3.

I ſhould

I should not perhaps, promise more than I could perform. In a Word, I take it to be that Hymn, a Fragment of which is preserved by *Clemens Alexandrinus*^m, and *Eusebius*ⁿ; and begins thus: — “ I
 “ will declare a Secret to the Initiated; but let
 “ the Doors be shut against the Profane. But thou,
 “ *Museus*, the Offspring of fair *Selene*, attend care-
 “ fully to my Song; for I shall speak of important
 “ Truths. Suffer not therefore the former Pre-
 “ possessions of your Mind to deprive you of that
 “ happy Life, which the Knowledge of these my-
 “ sterious Truths will procure you. But look on
 “ the Divine Nature, incessantly contemplate it,
 “ and govern well the Mind and Heart. Go on in
 “ the right Way, and see THE SOLE GOVERNOR
 “ OF THE WORLD: HE IS ONE, AND OF HIM-
 “ SELF ALONE; AND TO THAT ONE ALL THINGS
 “ OWE THEIR BEING. HE OPERATES THROUGH
 “ ALL, WAS NEVER SEEN BY MORTAL EYES, BUT
 “ DOES HIMSELF SEE EVERY THING.” The

^m *Admonitio ad Gentes*

ⁿ *Præp. Evang.* l. 13.

Ὁ Φθέρξομαι οἷς θέμις ἐστὶ, δύσως δ' ἐπιθεσθε βεβήλοις
 Πᾶσιν ὁμῶς· Ὡς δ' ἄκχε, φαισφόρος ἐκγονο μύνης,
 Μυστὰ· ἐξερέω γὰρ ἀληθεία· μηδὲ Ἰε τὰ πρὶν
 Ἐν σήθεσι φανέντα φίλης αἰῶνος ἀμέρῃ.
 Εἰς ἧ λόγον θεῖον βλέψας, τέτρω προσεδεδόξαι,
 Ἰθύων κραδῆς νοερὸν κύτος· ὧς δ' ἐπίδανε
 Ἀτραπίδ, μένον δ' ἐσόρα κόσμῳ ἀνακτα.
 Εἰς δ' ἐς αὐτολήνης, ἐνός ἐκγονο πάντε τέτυκται.
 Ἐν δ' αὐτοῖς αὐτὸς περὶσσεύει· ὕδ' τις αὐτὸν
 Εἰσοράα θνητῶν, αὐτὸς δὲ γε πάντας ὁρᾷται.

The Phrase *φίλης αἰῶνος ἀμέρῃ* is taken from *Homer*, who used it literally, as did *Hesiod*. Nor did the Author of this Hymn much deviate from that Sense. For Initiation into the Mysteries was esteemed a new Life; the restoring the Soul, as *Plato* says, to its original State of Perfection. Thus we see in the Chorus of the Initiated in *Aristophanes*, quoted above, they reckoned that they only enjoyed the Light of the Sun, and received Benefit from his Beams: Or in other Words, that they only could be esteemed alive.

Reasons,

Reasons, which induce me to think that this was the very Hymn sung on this Occasion in the Mysteries, are these: 1. We learn from the Scholiast on *Aristophanes*, and others, that there were Hymns sung in the Mysteries. 2. *Orpheus*, as we have said, first brought the Mysteries from *Egypt* into *Greece*, and even Religion itself. Hence it was called *Θρησκεία*, as being supposed the Invention of the *Thracian*. 3. The Verses, going under the Name of *Orpheus*, are, at least, more ancient than *Plato* and *Herodotus*; though since interpolated. The common Opinion went for their Genuineness; and those who doubted of that, gave them to the earliest *Pythagoreans*^p. 4. The Subject of them are the Mysteries, under the several Titles of *Θεονισμοὶ μυσταῖοι*, *τελεταί*, *ιερός λόγος*, and *ἡ εἰς ἁδὲς καλὰ ἔκαστις*. 5. *Pausanias* tells us, that *Orpheus's* Hymns were sung in the Rites of *Ceres*, in preference to *Homer's*, though more elegant, for the Reasons we have given above^q. 6. This Hymn is addressed to *Musæus*, his Disciple, who was said to institute the Mysteries at *Athens*, as his Master had done in *Thrace*^r. And begins with the Formulary used by the Mystagogue on that Occasion, warning the Profane to keep at distance. And in the fourth Line, mentioning that new Life or Regeneration, or State of Perfection, that the Initiated were taught to aspire to in the Mysteries, as hath been seen above. 7. No other Original, but the singing *Orpheus's* Hymns

^p *Laetius in vita Pythag.* and *Suidas voce*, *Ορφέως*.

^q *Ὅστις δ' αὖτε ποιητικῶς ἐπολυπραγµονήσεν, ἤδη τῷ Ὀρφῶος ὕμνῳ οἶδεν ὄντας, ἑκάστον τε αὐτῶν, ἐπὶ βραχυτάτῳ, καὶ τὸ σὺν παντὶ σὺν ἐκείνῳ πάλιν πεποιηµένους. Λυκομήδης δ' ἴσασι τε καὶ ἐπαύδασι τοῖς δαωµένοις κόσµῳ μὲν δὴ τ' ἐπὶ δαδ' ἐρεῖα φέρουσιν αὖν, μὲν Ὀρφέου γε τῷ ὕμνῳ τιμῆς δ' οὐκ ἔστι καὶ ἐς πλείονος ἐκείνων ἔχουσι. *Pausan.* l. 9. c. 30. *sub. fin.* And again, to the same Purpose, c. 27. of the same Book.*

^r *Tertull. Apol.*

in the *Eleusinian* Mysteries, can be well imagined of that popular Opinion mentioned by *Theodoret* of *Orpheus* instituting those Mysteries^f, when the *Athenians* had such certain Records of another Institutor. 8. But lastly, the Account, which *Clemens* gives of this Hymn, seems to put the Matter out of doubt: His Words are these: *But the Thracian Mystagogue, who was at the same Time a Poet, Orpheus the Son of Oeager, after he had opened the Mysteries, and sung the whole Theology of Idols, recants all he had said, and introduceth Truth. The Sacred then truly begin, though late, and thus he enters on the Matter*^g. To understand the Force of these Words, we are to know that the Mystagogue explained the Representations in the Mysteries; where, as we learn from *Apuleius*^h, the supernal and infernal Gods passed in Review. To each of these an Hymn was sung; which *Clemens* calls the *Theology of Images, or Idols*. These are yet to be seen amongst the Works, attributed to *Orpheus*. When all this was over, then came the *ὑπορρήσια* delivered in the Hymn in Question. And after that the Assembly was dismissed, with these two barbarous words, ΚΟΓΞ ΟΜΠΑΞ, which shews the Mysteries not to have been originally *Greek*. The Learned Mr. *Le Clerc* well observes, that this seems to be only an ill Pronunciation of *Kots* and *Omphets*, which, he tells us, signifies in the *Phœnician* Tongue, *watch and abstain from Evil*^w.

Thus the Reader, at length, sees the End and Use both of the greater and lesser Mysteries: and that,

^f See Note (i) Pag. 135.

^g Ὁ δὲ Θεράπων ἱεροφάντης καὶ ποιητὴς αἶμα, ὁ δὲ Ὀϊάρεω Ὀρφεύς, μὲν τὸ Ὀργίων ἱεροφάντιαν, καὶ τὸ εἰδώλων τὴν Θεολογίαν, παλινθεοδιδαν ἀληθείας εἰσάγει, τὸ ἱερὸν ὅτις οὐδέποτε, ὅμως δ' ἐν ἅδου ἀέθρῳ. *Admon. ad Gentes.*

^h *Met.* l. 11.

^w *Bibl. Univ.* Tom. 6. p. 86.

as well in what they hid, as in what they divulged, all aimed at the Benefit of the State. To this End, they were to draw in as many as they could; which they did by spreading abroad the Doctrine of a Providence, and a future State; and how much happier the Initiated should be, and what superior Felicities they were intitled to in another Life. And this is the Reason that all Antiquity is so full and expresse to this Matter. But then, they were to make those they had got in, as virtuous as possible; which could be done only by discovering the Delusion of Polytheism. And this, being supposed the shaking Foundations, was to be revealed with all possible Caution and Circumspection; and under the most tremendous Seal of Secrecy^x. Which is the Reason so little is to be met with in Antiquity concerning it: *Varro*, and *Cicero*, the two most inquisitive Persons in it, affording us but a glimmering Light. The first giving us a short Account of the Cause only of the *secret Doctrines*, without mentioning the Matter; and the other, a Hint of the Matter, without any Notice of the Cause. And it is no wonder, for the Betrayers of the Mysteries were punished capitally^y, and with merciless Severity. The Case of *Diagoras*, the *Melian*, is too remarkable to be omitted. This Man had revealed the *Orphic* and *Eleusinian* Mysteries: On which account, he passed with the People for an Atheist; which at once confirms what I have said of the Subject of the *secret Doctrines*; and of the Prejudice an indiscreet Communication of them would be to the State. He likewise dis-

^x See c. 20. of *Meursius's Eleusinia*.

^y Si quis arcanæ Mytheria Cereyis sacra vulgasset, lege morti addicebatur. Τὸν ἐξερπύλα τὰ μυστήρια τεθνάναι. Meminit hujus Legis Sopater in Divisione Quæstionis. *Sam. Petit in leges Atticas*, p. 33.

suaded his Friends from being initiated into these Rites: The Consequence of which was, that the City of *Athens* proscribed him, and set a Price upon his Head²; while *Socrates*, who preached up the same Kind of Doctrine, and so likewise a reputed Atheist, and *Epicurus* a real one, because they taught these Matters only as Principles of their Philosophy, to their own Sect, were suffered to live long unmolested. And this perhaps, was the Reason why *Socrates* declined being initiated³. Which, as it was a singular Affectation, exposed him to much Censure⁴. For while he continued so, the Doctrines he taught could never be wrested to be the revealing the *ἀπορρήτῳ* of the Mysteries. And what Danger there was in a Suspicion of this kind, he had a terrible Instance in the Poet *Æschylus*: who, on the mere Imagination of the People, that he had given a Hint of something in the Mysteries, in his Scenes, had like to have been torn in Pieces on the Stage: but flying to the Altar of *Bacchus*, he got Respite to appeal to the *Areopagus*, which acquitted him of the Imputation⁵.

But here now a remarkable Exception to all we have advanced concerning the Secrecy of the Mysteries, obtrudes itself upon us, in the Case of the *Cretans*; who, *Diodorus Siculus* tells us, celebrated their Mysteries openly, and taught every thing without reserve. His Words are these: *At Gnosus, in Crete, it was provided for by an ancient Law, that these Mysteries should be shewn openly to*

² *Suidas* voce *Διαγόρας* ὁ Μήλιος; — & etiam *Athenagoras* in *Legatione*.

³ For that he had a good Opinion of the Mysteries, appears from the *Phædo* of *Plato*.

⁴ "Οὐτε ἐμυθη μόνος, ἀπάλλω ταῖς ἑλδοσώαις. *Lucianus Demonaſte*.

⁵ *Clemens Alex. Strom.* 2. & *Aristotelis* l. 3. c. 1. *Nicom. Eth.* ad locum *Eustratiæ*.

all : and that, amongst them, no one should hide from any, who were willing to know them, those things, which, amongst others, were delivered in secret^d. Now, as contrary as this appears to what hath been said above, on attentive Reflection, it will be found throughly to confirm it. We have shewn above, that the grand Secret was the Detection of Polytheism ; which was done, as appears by Cicero, in teaching the Original of the Gods ; who were dead Mortals, raised to divine Honour, for public Benefits done to their Country, or Mankind. But, it is to be observed, that the Cretans proclaimed this to all the World, by shewing, and boasting of the Tomb of Jupiter himself ; the *Father of Gods and Men*. How then could they tell that as a Secret in their Mysteries, which they told every one out of them ? And this being the only Secret the Mysteries had, it is plain, the Cretan Mysteries must be without any. This it was, that so exasperated all Greece against them ; and gave Birth to the common Proverb of ΚΡΗΤΕΣ 'ΑΕΙ ΨΕΥΣΤΑΙ, the Cretans are eternal Liers. So Lucan^e :

Tam mendax Magni tumulo, quam Creta Tonantis.

For nothing could more affront the Idol Worshipers than the one, or more displease the politic Protectors of the Mysteries, than the other.

The Mysteries then being of so great Service to the State, we shall not be surprized to hear the

^d Καὶ αὖ τῇ Κρήτην ἐν Κνωσῶ νόμιμον ἐξ ἀρχαίων ἔχον φανερώς τὰς τελείας ταύτας πᾶσι ᾧδεδίδοσθαι, καὶ τὰ ᾧδὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐν δαπνρήτῳ ᾧδεδεδόμνα, παρ' αὐτοῖς μηδένα κρυπτεῖν τῷ βελομύθῳ τὰ τοιαῦτα γνώσκων, *Biblioth. l. 5.*

^e L. 8. And Callimachus:

Κρήτες αἰεὶ ψεύσασθαι. καὶ ΓΑΡ τάφον, ὃ ἄνα, σέιο

Κρήτες ἐτεκλήναντο.

Hymn. in Jovem.

And Nonnus:

Οὐ γὰρ αἰεὶ παρήμεναι Διὸς ΨΕΥΔΗΜΟΝΙ ΤΥΜΒΩ,

Τερεπομένη Κρήτεσσιν, ἐπεὶ πέλων ἡπεροπῆες. *Dionys. l. 8.*

wisest

wisest of the Ancients speaking highly in their Commendation; and their best Law-givers, and Reformers providing carefully for their Support. *Ceres*, says *Isocrates*, bath made the Athenians two Presents of the greatest Consequence: Corn, which brought us out of a State of Brutality; and the MYSTERIES, which teach the Initiated to entertain the most agreeable Expectations touching Death and Eternity^f. So *Plato* introduces *Socrates*, speaking after this Manner: In my Opinion, those who established the Mysteries, whoever they were, were well skilled in human Nature. For in these Rites it was of old signified to the Aspirants, that those who died without being initiated, stuck fast in Mire and Filth^g. And *Tully* thought them of such vast Use to Society, for thus preserving and propagating the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, that in the Law where he forbids nocturnal Sacrifices offered by Women, he makes an express Exception for the Mysteries of *Ceres*, as well as for the Sacrifices to the good Goddess. “Nocturna mulierum sacrificia ne sunt, præter olla, quæ pro populo rectè fiant. Neve quem initiant, nisi ut assolet Cereri, Græco sacro.” Which Law he thus comments: — *M.* But now *Titus*, as to what follows, “I would fain know how you can give your Assent, or I blame you for with-holding it?” *A.* What is that I pray you? *M.* The Law concerning the nocturnal Sacrifices of Women. *A.* I assent to it, especially as there is an express

^f Διμήτερος — δόσης δωρεάς διτλής, ὥστε μέγισται τυγχάνουσιν εἶναι τῆς τε καρπῆς δι’ ἧς καὶ θνητῶδες ζῆν ἡμᾶς αἰτίοι γίγνεται καὶ ἡ τελείη, ἥς οἱ μελίχοντες, πρὶν τε τῆς βίης τελευτῆς, καὶ τῆς σύμπαντος αἰῶνος ἡδύς τὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχουσιν. *Panegy.*

^g Καὶ κινδυνεύουσιν καὶ οἱ τὰς τελείας ἡμῖν εἶποι καλῶς σκευῆς, ὅ φανταί τινες εἶναι, ἀλλὰ τῷ ὄντι πάλαι αἰνέτησθαι, ὅτι ὅς ἐν ἀμύκητος, καὶ ἀνέλεστον εἰς ἄδην ἀφίκηται, ὃν βορβόρῳ κείσεται. *Phædone.*

“Exception

“ Exception to the public and solemn sacrifice. *M.*
 “ What then will become of our *Eleusinian* Rites,
 “ those reverend and august Mysteries; if, indeed,
 “ we take away nocturnal Celebrations? *For our*
 “ *Laws are calculated, not only for the Roman, but*
 “ *for all just, and well established Policies.* *A.* I think
 “ you except those, into which we ourselves have
 “ been initiated. *M.* Doubtless I do: For as, in my
 “ Opinion, your *Athens* has produced many excel-
 “ lent and even divine Inventions, and applied them
 “ to the Use of Life; so has she given nothing bet-
 “ ter than those Mysteries, by which we are drawn
 “ from an irrational and savage Life, and tamed,
 “ as it were, and broken to Humanity. They are
 “ truly called *INITIA* for they are indeed the Be-
 “ ginnings of a Life of Reason and Virtue. From
 “ whence we not only receive the Benefits of a more
 “ comfortable and elegant Subsistence here, but are
 “ taught to *hope for, and aspire to a better Life here-*
 “ *after.* But what it is that displeases me in noct-
 “ urnal Rites, the Comic Poets will shew you^b.
 “ Which Liberty of Celebration, had it been per-
 “ mitted at *Rome*, what Wickedness would not he
 “ have attemptedⁱ, who came with a premeditated

^b The common Reading in which all the MSS. agree, is, *Quid mihi displiceat, INNOCENTES poetæ indicant Comici.* *Victorius* conjectured, instead of *innocentes*, *Tully* wrote *IN NOCTURNIS*. And the greatest Critic of this Age, who honoured me with his Observations on this difficult Passage, struck out the same Emendation, on reading over the quoted Words, where he had none of the Editions of *Tully* at Hand to consult. He very acutely observes that *innocentes*, in the Sense it must be here understood, seems not to be *Latin*; that it is besides, quite superfluous; and that something appears plainly to be wanting after *displaceat*. His Sense of the whole Passage is given above: I am persuaded that by the *poetæ comici*, *Cicero* had the Writers of the *new Comedy* in his Mind. The Abuses he hints at, as perpetrated in the Mysteries, were those of a libidinous kind; which occasioned an Intrigue proper for the *new Comedy*. And we may see by *Fabricius's Notitia Comitorum deperditorum Bib. Græ. l. 2. c. 22.* how frequently the Writers of the *new Comedy* laid the Scene of their Plots in a religious Festival or Mystery.

ⁱ I conjecture that by the *Ille*, here, is meant *P. Clodius*, the mortal Enemy of *Cicero*, of whom he thus speaks, in his *Orat.*

“ Design to execute his Lust, to a Sacrifice where
 “ even the Misbehaviour of the Eye was highly
 “ criminal^k.

We have seen, that the other Exception to this Law, against nocturnal Sacrifices, was in favour of the Rites performed to the *Good Goddess*, called *the public and solemn Sacrifice*. This was offered *pro Populo*, for the Safety of the People. So that *Cicero*, ranking the *Eleusinian* with these Rites, appears to have thought those in the Number of *de Har. resp.* § 5. “ *De Religionibus sacris & ceremoniis est concionatus, patres conscripti, Clodius. P. inquam, Clodius sacra & religiones negligi, violari, pollui questus est: non mirum, si hoc vobis ridiculum videtur: etiam sua concio risit hominem, quomodo ipse gloriari solet, ducentis confixum senatus-consultis: quæ sunt omnia contra illum pro religionibus facta, hominemque eum, qui pulvinaribus BONÆ DEÆ stuprum intulerit, eaque sacra quæ viri oculis ne imprudentis quidem adspici fas est, non solum adspectu virili, sed Agitis stuproque violarit, in concione de religionibus neglectis conqueri.*” So that *Tully’s* Reasoning seems to be this. — *I allow an Exception for the Eleusinian Mysteries, on Account of their great Use to civil Life. But yet their Celebration in the Night is attended with strange Inconveniencies, as appears from the Comic Poets. And had this Liberty of celebrating nocturnal Rites by Men and Women promiscuously, as in the Eleusinian Mysteries, been practised in Rome; what Enormities must we believe such a one as Clodius would have committed, who contrived to violate the nocturnal Rites of the Good Goddess, to which only Women were admitted?*

^k *M.* At verò, quod sequitur, quomodo aut tu assentire, aut ego reprehendam, sanè quæro, *Tite.* *A.* Quid tandem est? *M.* De nocturnis sacrificiis mulierum. *A.* Ego vero assentior, excepto præsertim in ipsa lege solemnî sacrificiis ac publico. *M.* Quid ergo aget Iaccus Eumolpidæque nostri, & augusta illa Mystéria, siquidem sacra nocturna tollimus? non enim populo Romano, sed omnibus bonis firmisque populis leges damus. *A.* Excipis, credo, illa, quibus ipsi initiati sumus. *M.* Ego vero excipiam. Nam mihi cum multa eximia divinaque videntur *Athenæ* tue peperisse, atque in vita hominum attulisse, tum nihil melius illis Mytheriis, quibus ex agresti immanique vita exculsi ad humanitatem, & mitigati sumus: initiaque ut appellantur, ita re vera principia vitæ cognovimus; neque solum cum lætitiâ vivendi rationem accepimus, sed etiam cum spe meliorem moriendi. Quid autem mihi displiceat, in nocturnis Poetæ indicant Comici. Quæ licentiâ *Romæ* datâ, quidnam egisset ille, qui in sacrificium cogitatam libidinem intulit, quò ne imprudentiam quidem oculorum adjici fas fuit? *De Leg. l. 2. c. 14.*

such as were celebrated for the public Safety. *Solon*, the famous *Athenian* Legislator, long before him, had the same high Opinion of these Mysteries, as is seen by the care he took of their Regulation; as had *Prætextatus*, a most accomplished *Roman* Magistrate, long after him: For when his Master, *Valentinian*, had divided the Empire with his Brother, and projected a general Reform of the Laws, and, amongst the rest, had prohibited nocturnal Sacrifices; he was persuaded by *Prætextatus*, who governed for him in *Greece*, to make an exception for the Mysteries of *Ceres*; which had been brought to *Rome* very early^m, and incorporated into the national Worshipⁿ, and regulated anew by the wise Emperor *Hadrian*^o.

Sozimus tells the Story in this manner: “ The
 “ supreme Power being thus divided, *Valentinian*
 “ entered on his new Command with a more serious
 “ Attention to his Office. He reformed the Ma-
 “ gistracy, he regulated the Revenue, and, by a
 “ rigid Exaction of it, secured the Pay of the Sol-
 “ diery, which arose from thence: And having
 “ determined likewise to new model and promulge
 “ the Imperial Institutes, *beginning*, as they say,
 “ from the Foundation, he forbade the Celebration
 “ of all nocturnal Rites and Sacrifices; with design
 “ to obviate those Enormities; that the Opportuni-
 “ ty of such Occasions give birth to. But when
 “ *Prætextatus*, a Man adorned with every Virtue
 “ of public and private Life, who then governed
 “ *Greece* in quality of Proconsul, had given him
 “ to understand that this Law would occasion great
 “ Disorders in *Greece*, and even throw the Inhabi-

^m As appears by *Tully's* Oration for *Corn. Balbus*, and by a passage in his second Book, c. 24. Of the Nature of the Gods, quoted above.

ⁿ *Suetonius* vitâ *Aug.* c. 93. ^o *Aurel. Victor* in *Hadri.*

“tants into Despair, when they should find that
 “they were forbid to celebrate, according to an-
 “cient Custom, those most holy Mysteries, which
 “had now taken in the whole Race of Mankind, he
 “gave permission to a Suspension of his Law with
 “regard to these; on condition, however, that
 “every thing should be reduced to the primitive
 “Purity and Simplicity^P.” Thus the *Eleusinian*
 Mysteries got a Reprieve ’till the Reign of *Theodo-*
sus the Elder, when they were totally abolished.
 The Expression *Prætextatus* used to shew the ill
 Consequence of the Prohibition, is very remarka-
 ble: He said, the *Greeks* would from thence lead
 ΑΒΙΩΤΟΝ ΒΙΟΝ *a comfortless lifeless Life*. Now
 this could not with any Truth, or Propriety, be
 said of the taking away a mere religious Rite,
 how venerable soever become by its Antiquity.
 To understand the Force of it, we must have in
 mind what has been said of the Doctrines taught
 in those Rites; namely, of a Providence, and a
 future State of Rewards and Punishments, on whose
 sole account the Rites were instituted. Now these
 Doctrines being in themselves of the most agreeable
 engaging Nature, taught here in the most interest-
 ing manner, and receiving from hence their chief
 Support; it was no wonder that the *Greeks* should
 esteem the Abolition of the Mysteries as the greatest

P Τῆς τοίνυν δόξης ἔγω Διαιρεθείσης, ὁ Ὀυαλενινιανὸς ἐμβολέεσθαι
 τῇ δόξῃ προσελθὼν, ἀρχοντας τε ἐν κόσμῳ παρῆγεν, καὶ περὶ ταῖς εἰς-
 πορεύσεσιν τῶν εἰσφορῶν, καὶ τὰς ἐν τούτων χορηγηθείσας σφαιρωτικὰς
 σιτήσεις, ἀκριβοῦσαί τε ἦν. ἔπει δὲ καὶ νόμων εἰσφορὰς ἐγνώκει ποιή-
 σαα, ἀφ’ ἐτίας ὥσπερ δὲξάμην, τὰς νυκτερινὰς ἐκάλυψε δυσίας
 ἐπιτελεῖσθαι τοῖς μυσταῖς μὴ ἂν παρατομῆσις ἐμποδῶν Διὰ τὸ τοιοῦ-
 νόμῳ γενέσθαι βαλόμην. ἔπει δὲ Περιεξτάτῃ, ὁ τ’ Ἑλλάδ’ ἔτ’ ἀνθύ-
 πατος ἔχων δόξην, ἀνὴρ ἐν πάσαις Διαιρέσιν ταῖς δόξαις, τέτοιον ἔφη
 τὸ νόμον ΑΒΙΩΤΟΝ τοῖς Ἑλλήσι καλεῖσθαι τὸ ΒΙΟΝ, εἰ μέλλουσιν
 καλεῖσθαι τὰ σωέγοντα τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος ἀγιώτατα μυστήρια καὶ
 ἱστορίαν ἐκτελεῖν ἐπίτρεψεν, δὲν βίῃ τ’ νόμῳ· πρῶτί τε δὲ πάντες
 καὶ ταῖς δόξαις πάτεραι. *Lib. 4. Hist. novæ.*

Evil ;

Evil; the Life of Man being, indeed, without the Comfort and Support of these Doctrines, no better than a *living Death*: And on this account it was, that the sage *Isocrates* called the Mysteries the thing *Human Nature principally stands in need of*^a. Indeed the *Greeks* seemed to place their chief Happiness in them: So *Euripides* makes *Hercules* say^r, *I was happy when I got a sight of the Mysteries*: and it was a proverbial Expression, where one thought himself in the highest degree so, to say, *I seem as if I had been initiated in the higher Mysteries*^t.

1. But now, such is the Fate of all human things, these Mysteries, venerable as they were, did, it must be owned, in process of time, degenerate; and those very Provisions made by the State, to enable the Mysteries to compass the End, for which they were established, proved the total Defeat of that End. For we can assign no greater Cause, besides Time, which naturally and fatally viciates and depraves all things, of the horrid Abuses and Corruptions of the Mysteries, than the Season in which they were performed, and the profound Secrecy observed in them: For the Night gave Opportunity to wicked Men to attempt ill Actions, and the Secrecy, Encouragement to perpetrate them: and the Inviolableness of that Secrecy, which encouraged Abuses, kept those Abuses from the Magistrate so long, that it was too late to reform them. In short, we must own, that these Mysteries, so powerful in their first Institution, for promoting Virtue and Knowledge^t, became, in time, horribly corrupt, the Season of Lust and Re-

^a Οὐ πρῶτον ἡ φύσις ἡμῶν ἐδείχθη. *Panegy.*

^r Τὰ μυστῶν δ' ὄργι' εὐτύχησ' ἰδὼν. *Herc. furens*, v. 612.

^t Ἐποπτεύειν μοι δοκῶ.

^e — Τὰ μυστήρια — ὅτι ἐπὶ παιδείᾳ καὶ ἐπαγωγῇ εἰς βίαν καλεσάθη πάντα ταῦτα ὑπὸ τῆς παλαιᾶς.

venge. Nor, considering the Circumstances above, are we to wonder at it. Even in the first and purest Ages of our holy Religion itself, a like Corruption, from the like Cause, crept into the Church. The primitive Christians, in imitation, I suppose, of these Pagan Rites, brought a Custom into the Church of celebrating Vigils in the Night; which, at first were performed with the utmost Sanctity and Purity: but, in a little time, became so abused, that it was necessary to abolish them. The account *Bellarmino* gives of them, is this: *Quoniam occasione nocturnarum vigiliarum abusus quidam irreperere cœperant, vel potius flagitia non raro committi, placuit ecclesiæ nocturnos conventus & vigiliis propriè dictas intermittere, ac solum in iisdem diebus celebrare jejunia*^a. And the same Remedy, *Cicero* tells us, *Diagondas*, the *Theban*, was forced to apply to the Disorders of the Mysteries^w.

2. However this was not the sole, tho' greatest Cause of the Depravation of the Mysteries. Another doubtless was their being sometimes under the Patronage of those Deities, who were supposed to inspire and preside over irregular Passions; such as *Bacchus*, *Venus*, and *Cupid*; who all had their Mysteries: for where was the wonder, if the Initiated should be sometimes inclined to give a loose to those Debaucheries, with which the Patron God was so much delighted? And in this Case, the hidden Doctrine came too late to stop the Disorder. But this however is most remarkable, as fully confirming what we have said concerning the Origin of the Mysteries, being invented to perpetuate the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, that this Doctrine continued to be taught

^a *De Eccl. triumph. l. 3. c. ult.*

^w — Atque omnia nocturna, ne nos duriores fortè videamur, in media Græcia *Diagondas Thebanus* lege perpetua sustulit. *De Legibus, l. 2. c. 15.*

even in the most corrupt Celebrations of the Mysteries of *Cupid*^x and *Bacchus*^y. Nay, even that very flagitious part of the Mysteriorious Rites, when they were at the worst, the carrying the ΚΤΕΙΣ and ΦΑΛΛΟΣ in Procession, was introduced, but under the pretence of their being *Emblems*^z of that mystical Regeneration and new Life, the Initiated had engaged themselves into.

3. The last Cause I shall assign of the Corruption of the Mysteries, was the Celebrators of them withdrawing themselves from the Care and Inspection of the Civil Magistrate: For as they were, originally, his Institution, so throughout Greece, in the purer Times, the Deputies of the States presided in their Celebrations; and so long they were secure from notorious Abuses: But in after times it would happen, that a *little Priest*, who had borne a share in these Rites, would leave his Society and Country, and set up for himself; and so in a clandestine manner, without Allowance or Knowledge of the Magistrate, institute and celebrate the Mysteries in a private Cabal: And from Rites so managed, it was no wonder if the most flagitious

^x Ἀγαθὸν μὲν, ὡς ἔταίρε, τὸ ἐν Ἑλδυσσίνι τελετῆς μετὰχεῖν. ἐγὼ δ' ὁρῶ τοῖς ΕΡΩΤΟΣ ὁρσιασταῖς καὶ μύσαις ἐν αὐτῷ βελτίονα μοῖραν ἔσαν. *Plutarchus* Ἐξωλίκῳ.

^y Κελσός — οἰεταί γε ἐπὶ θάμβει τῶν ἰδιωτῶν ταυτῶν ἡμᾶς ποιεῖν, οὐχὶ δὲ τάλιθ' ὥστε κολάσεων λέγοντας ἀναγκαίων τοῖς ἡμαρτηκόσι. διόπερ' ἐξομοῖοι ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἐν ταῖς ΒΑΚΧΙΚΑΙΣ τελεταῖς τὰ φάσματά καὶ δαίματά παρεισάγῃσι. *Orig. contra Celsum*, l. 4. p. 167. Sp.

^z Καὶ γὰρ αἱ τελεταί, καὶ τὰ ὁρσία, τὰ τῶν εἰχιν' Αἰνιγμᾶτα. τὸν κτύπον μὲν ἡ Ἑλδυσίς, ἡ φάλαγγος γὰρ δὲ τὸ φάλο. *Theodoret. Therap.* l. 7. So *Tertullian* against the *Valentinians* says, "Virile membrum totum esse MYSTERIUM." *Jamblicus* gives another Reason for these things, ὅτι τὸ ἐν τε κωμῳδίᾳ καὶ τραγῳδίᾳ ἀπόδεσθαι πάθη θεωρεῖν, ἵνα μὴ τὰ οἰκεία πάθη, καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐργασίαν ἀπεργασθῇ, καὶ ἀποκαθαίρωται. ἐν τε τοῖς ἱεροῖς, διαμασί τισι καὶ ἀκρομασί τῶν αἰχρῶν, ἀπλυνόμεθα τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν ἑρῶν ἀπ' αὐτῶν συμπιπτόσθαι βλάβος. *De Mysterioriis*, sect. 1. c. 11.

Enormities took their birth. This was the Original of all those horrid Impieties committed in the Mysteries of *Bacchus* at *Rome*; of which the Historian *Livy* gives us so circumstantial an Account: For, in the beginning of his Story, he tells us it happened by a little Priest's bringing the Mysteries into *Etruria*, on his own head; uncommissioned by his Superiors in *Greece*, from whom he learnt them; and unauthorised by the State, into which he introduced them. The Words of *Livy* shew that the Mysteries were, in their own Nature, quite another thing; and invented for the Improvement of Knowledge and Virtue. ^a *A Greek of mean Extraction, a little Priest and Soothsayer, came first into Etruria, WITHOUT ANY SKILL OR WISDOM IN MYSTERIOUS RITES, MANY SORTS OF WHICH THAT MOST IMPROVED PEOPLE HATH BROUGHT IN AMONGST US, FOR THE CULTURE AND PERFECTION BOTH OF MIND AND BODY.* It is further observable, that this Priest brought the Mysteries pure with him into *Italy*, and that they received their Corruption there: For, as *Hispala* tells the Story to the Consul, at first, Women only celebrated the Rites; 'till *Paculla Minia Campana* became Priestess; who, on a sudden, as by order of the Gods, made a total alteration in the Ceremonies, and initiated her Sons; which introduced all the Debaucheries that followed^b. The Consequence of the Detection of this

^a Græcus ignobilis in Etruriam primum venit, NULLA CUM ARTE EARUM, QUAS MULTAS AD ANIMORUM CORPORUMQUE CULTUM NOBIS ERUDITISSIMA OMNIUM GENS INVENIT, sed Sacrificulus & Vates. *Hist. Lib. 39.*

^b There is something so extraordinary in *Hispala's* Confession, as to make it worth transcribing; that the Reader may in one view, see the Kind and Degree of these Corruptions. — Tum *Hispala* originem sacrorum expromit. Primo sacrarium id sceminarum fuisse, nec quemquam virum eo admitti solitum. —

Pacullam

this hidden Scene of Wickedness was the Abolition of the Rites of *Bacchus* throughout *Italy*, by a Decree of the Senate: not of the Mysteries in general; they were of too important Use to the State, to be parted with *ob unius delictum*.

However it is very true, that in *Greece* itself the Mysteries, of all Kinds, became most notoriously and abominably abused^c: the clearest Proof of which is, that their Comic Writers very frequently laid the Scene of their Subject, such as the Rape of a young Girl, and the like, at the Celebration of a religious Mystery; and from that Mystery, denominated the Comedy^d. But notwithstanding all Occasions and Opportunities of Corruption, some of the Mysteries, as particularly the *Eleusinian*, continued, for very many Ages, pure and undefiled. These were, indeed, the last that submitted to the common Fate of all human Institutions.

It is true, if uncertain Report was to be credited, the Mysteries were very early corrupted: For Or-

Pacullam sacerdotem omnia, tamquam Deum monitis, immutasse: nam & viros eam primam suos filios initiasse; & nocturnum sacrum ex diurno, & pro tribus in anno diebus quinos singulis mensibus dies initiorum fecisse: ex quo in promiscuo sacra sint, & permisti viri foeminis, & noctis licentia accesserit; nihil ibi facinori, nihil flagitii praetermissum; plura virorum inter sese, quam foeminarum esse stupra. Si qui minus patientes dedecoris sint, & pigriores ad facinus, pro victimis immolari: nihil nefas ducere. Hanc summam inter eos religionem esse; viros velut mente captum jactatione fanatica corporis vaticinari — Raptos a Diis homines dici, quos machinae illigatos ex conspectu in abditos specus abripiant; eos esse, qui aut conjurare, aut fociari facinoribus, aut stuprum pati noluerint; multitudinem ingentem, alterum jam prope populum esse: in his nobiles quosdam viros, foeminasque. Biennio proximo institutum esse, ne quis major viginti annis initiaretur; captari aetates & erroris & stupri patientes.

^c See *Clemens Alexandrinus* in his *Admonitio ad gentes*.

^d See *Fabricius's Notitia Comicoꝝ deperditorum*, in his first Vol. of the *Bibl. Grae.* l. 2. c. 22.

phæus himself is said to have abused them^e. But this was an Art the debauched *Myſtæ* of later Times made use of, to countenance their Enormities ; as the detestable Pæderasts of after Ages scandalized the godlike *Socrates* : Besides, the Fable was so ill laid, that it was detected by the sure Monuments of Antiquity : For, in consequence of what they pretended was perpetrated by *Orpheus* in the Myſteries, they reported that he was torn to pieces by the Women : whereas it appeared from the Inscription on his Monument at *Dium* in *Macedonia*, that he was struck dead with Lightning ; the Death, as it was esteemed by the Ancients, of the Favourites of Heaven^f.

And here the Fathers will hardly escape their Censure, who refuse to allow high Provocation to be an Excuse for an unfair Representation of an Adversary, for accustoming themselves to speak of the Myſteries as gross Impieties and Immoralities, in their original Institution^g. *Clemens Alexander*, in the heat of Zeal, thus expresses himself : *Be he accursed who first infected the World with these Impostures, whether it was Dardanus — or — &c. These I make no scruple to call wicked Authors of im-*

^e *Diog. Laert. Proæmium Segm. 5.*

^f *Idem ibid.*

^g What hath been said above shews Mr. *Le Clerc* hath gone into the other extreme, when he contends [*Bib. Univ. tom. 6. p. 73.*] the Myſteries were not corrupted at all. 'I can conceive no Reason of his espousing this Paradox, but as it favoured an Accusation against the Fathers, who have much insisted on the Corruption of them — Les Peres ont dit qu'on commettoit toute sorte d'ordures dans ces cérémonies : mais quoi qu'ils disent, il n'est pas croiable que toute la Grece, quelque corrompue qu'elle ait été, ait jamais consenti que les filles & les femmes se prostituassent dans les mylteres — Mais quelques auteurs Chrétiens n'ont fait aucune difficulté de dire mille choses peu conformes à la vérité, pour diffamer le Paganisme : de peur qu'il n'y eût que les Payens à qui on pût reprocher leurs calomnies. *Bib. Univ. tom. 6. p. 120.*

pious Fables; the Fathers of an execrable Superstition, who by this Institution sowed in human Life the Seeds of Vice and Corruptionⁿ. But, the wisest, and best Men, in the Pagan World, are unanimous in this, that the Mysteries were instituted pure; and proposed the noblest End, by the worthiest Means. Nor could it be otherwise, as we shall see when we come to speak of their Original.

The Truth of the matter was this, the Fathers bore a secret grudge to them for their injurious treatment of Christianity on its first appearance. We have observed above, that Impiety to the Gods, by which was meant Atheism, was reckoned, in the Mysteries, amongst the greatest Crimes; and most severely punished in their Shews and Representations. So in *Virgil*, of which more hereafter, the first and hottest Seats in *Tartarus* are allotted to the Atheists, such as *Salomoneus*, *Tityus*, the *Titans*, &c. Now the Christians, on their first appearance, being esteemed Atheists by the People, were so branded by the Mystagogue, as we find in *Lucian*ⁱ; and exposed amongst the rest in *Tartarus*, in their solemn Representations: This I gather from a remarkable Passage in *Origen*; where *Celsus* thus addresses his Adversary: *But now, as you, good Man, believe eternal Punishments, even so do the Interpreters of these holy Mysteries, the Mystagogues and Initiators: You threaten others with them; THESE, on the contrary, THREATEN YOU*^k. This explains

^h Ὁμοιοὶς ἦν ὁ τῆσδε ἀρχαῆς ἀπάτης ἀνθρώποις· εἴτε ὁ Δαΐδων — ἦτε — τάτως ἐγὼ γ' ἂν ἐρχομαι φήσομαι μύθων ἀθέων, καὶ θεοδαιμονίας ὀλιθεῖν πατέρας, σπέρμα κακίας καὶ φθορᾶς ἐγκαταφυγεῖσαι τῷ βίῳ τὰ μυστήρια. *Admonitio ad gentes.*

ⁱ Καὶ οὐ μὴ τῇ πρώτῃ, [τὸ τελεῖ ἢς ἡμέρῃς] πρὸς ῥήσις ἢ ὡς περ Ἀθήνησι, τοιαύτη· εἴ τις ἀθεῖ; ἢ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΟΣ, ἢ Ἐπικέρῃς, ἢ καὶ καλῶς κοπῇ τὸ ἔργον, φεύγειτω — *Pseudomantis.*

^k Μάλιστα β, ὃ βέλτε, ὡς περ σὺ πολάσεις αἰωνίως τομίζεις· εἴτα καὶ οἱ τὸ ἱερὸν σκάνον ἐξηγῆται, τελεσά τε καὶ μυστήρια· ὥς σὺ μὴ ἄλλοις ἀπὸ καλῆς, ἐκείνοι δὲ σοί. l. 8.

a Passage in *Jerom's* Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers ; and will be explained by it. The Father speaking of *Quadratus*, says : “ Cumque Hadrianus Athenis exegisset hyemem invisens Eleusinem, & omnibus pænè Græciæ sacris initiatum, dedisset occasionem iis, qui Christianos oderrunt, absque præcepto Imperatoris vexare credentes, porrexit ei librum pro religione nostra.” Now what *occasion* was here afforded to the Enemies of Christianity, but only this, that in the *Græcian* Mysteries the Christians being odiously represented, the Emperor's Mind might be reasonably imagined estranged and indisposed towards them, and so the easier drawn to countenance, or connive at any Violence offered to them.

This then, without doubt, was the Cause that sharpened the Fathers against the Mysteries ; and they were not always tender in loading what they did not like. But here comes in the surprizing part of the Story ; that after this, they should so studiously and affectedly transfer the Terms, Phrases, Formularies, Rites, Ceremonies, and Discipline of these *odious Mysteries* into our holy Religion ; and, thereby, very early viciate and deprave, what a Pagan Writer¹ could see and acknowledge, was *ABSOLUTA & SIMPLEX*, as it came out of the Hands of its divine Author. Sure then it was some more than ordinary Veneration the People had for these Mysteries, that could incline the Fathers of the Church to so fatal a Counsel : however the Fact is notorious^m, and the Effects are but too visible.

We

¹ *Amm. Marcellinus*, l. 21. c. 16. *Hist.*

^m The Reader will not be displeased to find here an exact Account of this whole Matter, extracted from a very curious Dissertation of a great and unexceptionable Writer ; *Is. Casaubon's* 16 Exerc. against the Annals of *Baronius*. — *Pii Patres quum intel-*

We have represented, and all along supposed the Mysteries an Invention of the Legislator: and, but upon this supposition, the whole Matter nothing concerned us. Now, though by what has been

intelligent, quo facilius ad veritatis amorem corruptas superstitione mentes traducerent; & verba sacrorum illorum quam plurima, in suos usus transtulerunt; & cum doctrinæ veræ capita aliquot sic tractarunt, tum ritus etiam nonnullos ejusmodi instituerunt; ut videantur cum Paulo dicere gentibus voluisse ἃ ἀγνοῦντες οὐσεῖτε, ταῦτα καὶ ἀγνοοῦντες ὑμῖν. Hinc igitur est, quod sacramenta Patres appellarunt *Mysteria*, μύησις, τελετας, τελειώσεις, ἐποπείας, sive ἐποψείας, τελεσθήρια; interdum etiam ὄρεια, sed rarius: peculiariter verò Eucharistiam τελετῶν τελετήν; dicitur etiam antonomastice τὸ μυστήριον, aut numero multitudinis τὰ μυστήρια. Apud Patres passim de sacra communione leges, Φρακτὰ μυστήρια vel τὸ ἀπὸρρήθην μυστήριον; Gregorio Magno, *magnum & parvum mysterium*. Μυστήριον in veterum monumentis sæpe leges, pro Cœnæ Dominicæ fieri particeps: μύησιν pro ipsa actione; μύητης est sacerdos, qui etiam dicitur ὁ μυσταγωγῶν & ὁ ἱεροφειδής. In Liturgiis Græcis & alibi etiam ἡ ἱερὰ τελετή, & ἡ κρυφία καὶ ἐπίφοβος τελετή, est Eucharistia. Quemadmodum autem gradus quidem in Mysteriis Paganicis servati sunt, sic Dionysius distinguit in tres actiones, quæ & ritibus & temporibus erant divisæ: Prima est καθαρσις, purgatio; altera μύησις, initiatio; tertia, τελείωσις, consummatio; quam & ἐποψίαν sæpe nominat. Spem meliorem morientibus attulisse Mysteria Attica dicebat paulo antè M. Tullius. Patres contra, certam salutem & vitam æternam Christi Mysteria dignè percipientibus afferre, confirmabant; qui illa contemnerent servari non posse: Finem verò & fructum ultimum Sacramentorum θεῶν deificationem dicere non dubitarunt; quum scirent vanarum superstitionum auctores, suis *croptis* eum honorem audere spondere. Passim igitur legas apud Patres, τῆς ἱερῆς μυσταγωγίας τέλος ἢ θεῶσιν, finem sacramentorum esse, ut qui vera fide illa perciperent, in futura vita dii evadant. Athanasius verbo θεοποιείας in eam rem est usus; quod mox ab eodem explicatur, participatione Spiritûs conjungimur Deitati. De symbolis Sacramentorum, per quæ divinæ illæ ceremoniæ celebrantur, nihil attinet hoc loco dicere: illud vero, quod est & appellatur fidei symbolum, diversum est generis, & fidelibus tessera usum præstat, per quam se mutuo agnoscunt, qui pietati sacramento dixerunt: cujusmodi tesseras fuisse etiam in Paganorum Mysteriis ostendimus. Formulæ illi in Mysteriis peragendis usurpatæ *Procul este Profani!* respondet in Liturgia hæc per Diaconos pronuntiari solita: ὅσοι καὶ ὁχλῶμοι παρεγένετε; vel, ἔξω ἀπὸ πατρίδος ὅσοι ἐκκλησῖοι, ὅσοι ἀμί-

been said, the intelligent Reader may collect a Demonstration of it; yet, as this is the principal Point, it will not be amiss to give here a formal Proof of it.

That the Mysteries were invented, established, and supported by the Legislature, may be seen,

1. From the Place of their Birth and Original; which was *Egypt*. This *Herodotus*, *Diodorus*, and *Plutarch*, from the most ancient Testimony, expressly affirm: and in this all Antiquity is unanimous: the *Eleusinian* Mysteries particularly, retaining the very *Egyptian* Gods, in whose Honour they were there celebrated; *Ceres* and *Triptolemus* being only two other Names for *Isis* and *Osiris*; as we have seen above from *Theodoret*: and so *Tibullus*, —

ἀμύνητοι; Omnes Catechumeni foras discedite, omnes possēsi, omnes non initiati. Noctu ritus multi in Mysteriis peragebantur; noctu etiam initiatio Christianorum inchoabatur; Gaudentio nominatur splendidissima nox vigiliarum. Quod autem dicebamus de silentio in sacris oportaneis servari a paganis solito; id institutum veteres Christiani sic probarunt, ut religiosa ejus observatione mystas omnes longè superarint. Quemadmodum igitur dicit Seneca, sanctiora sacrorum solis initiatis fuisse nota: & Jamblicus de Philosophia Pythagoreorum in τὰ ἀπόρρητα, quæ efferri non poterant, & τὰ ἔκφορα, quæ foras efferre jus erat; ita universam doctrinam Christianam veteres distinguebant in τὰ ἔκφορα, id est, ea quæ enuntiari apud omnes poterant, & τὰ ἀπόρρητα arcana temere non vulganda: τὰ δόγματα, inquit Basilii, σιωπᾷ τὰ ἡ κερύματα ἐκπορεύονται. Dogmata silentio premuntur; præconia publicantur. Chrysostomus de iis qui baptizantur pro mortuis: Cupio quidem perspicuè rem dicere; sed propter non initiatos non audeo: hi interpretationem reddunt nobis difficiliorem; dum nos cogunt, aut perspicuè non dicere; aut arcana quæ taceri debent, apud ipsas efferre. Atque ut ἐξορχεῖσθαι τὰ μυστήρια dixerunt Pagani, de iis qui arcana mysteriorum evulgabant; ita dixit Dionysius, Vide ne enunties, aut parum reverenter habeas sancta sanctorum. Passim apud Augustinum leges, Sacramentum quod norunt fideles. In Johannem tract. 11. autem sic: Omnes Catechumeni jam credunt in nomine Christi, SED IESUS NON SE CREDIT EIS. Mox. Interrogemus Catechumenum, Manducas carnem filii hominis? nescit quid dicimus. Iterum, Nesciunt Catechumeni quid accipiant Christiani: erubescant ergo quia nesciunt.

Primus

*Primus aratra manu sollerti fecit OSIRIS,
Et teneram ferro sollicitavit humumⁿ.*

But the Similitude between the Rites practised, and the Doctrines taught in the *Grecian* and *Egyptian* Mysteries, would be alone sufficient to point up to their Original : such as the Secrecy required of the Initiated ; which, as we shall see hereafter, peculiarly characterized the *Egyptian* Teaching : The Doctrines of a Metempsychosis, and a future State of Rewards and Punishments, taught therein, which the *Greek* Writers agree to have been first set abroad by the *Egyptians*^o : Abstinence from

ⁿ Mr. *Le Clerc* owns that *Plutarch*, *Diodorus*, and *Theodoret*, have all said this ; yet, the better to support his Scheme in the Interpretation of the History of *Ceres*, he has thought fit to contradict him. But his Reason is very extraordinary — C'etoit la Coutume des Paiens de dire que des Divinitez étoient les mêmes, lors qu'ils avoient remarqué quelque legere ressemblance entre elles, dans la fausse pensée où ils étoient que les plus grands de leurs Dieux s'étoient fait connoître dans toute la terre : au lieu qu'il n'y en avoit aucun qui ne fut TOPIQUE, c'est à dire particulier à un lieu — On en trouvera divers exemples dans le petit traité de la Déesse de Syrie. Bibl. Univ. tom. 6. p. 121. It is very true that the Gods of the Pagans were local Deities : but to think the Ancients were ignorant of this, when it is from the Nature and Genius of Paganism, as delivered by them, that we come to know it, is the most extraordinary Imagination. Indeed the Moderns, possessed with contrary Ideas, were and are generally unattentive to this Truth ; and so have committed many Errors in their Reasonings on that Subject : but that Principle of the *Intercommunity in Worship* in ancient Paganism, delivered by us in another place, would have the same Effect in spreading the Worship, as if their Gods were universal and not local : Which shews the Ancients not mistaken in the Point in question. But what is pleasant in this matter is to find *Lucian*, who was no Modern, referred to as proving the Ancients mistaken in their Notions of their Deities, who only tells us what they thought.

^o *Timæus* the *Lacrian*, in his Book of the Soul of the World, speaking of the necessity of inculcating the Doctrine of future Punishments, calls them TIMOPIAI EENAI, FOREIGN TORMENTS : By which Name both *Latin* and *Greek* Writers always mean *Egyptian*, where the Subject is Religion.

domestic

domestic Fowl, Fish and Beans^p, the peculiar Superstition of the *Egyptians*: The Engraving the Ritual of the Mysteries on *two Stone Tables*^q, which it is plain were *Egyptian*, from their being full of *Hieroglyphics*; as we learn from *Apuleius*^r. But it would be endless to reckon up all the Particulars in which the *Egyptian* and *Græcian* Mysteries agreed: It shall suffice to say, in a word, that they were in all things the same.

But farther; nothing but the Supposition of this

^p See *Porphyrius de Abstin.*

^q Φινεάταις ᾗ καὶ Δῆμιόγῳ· ἐσιν ἱερὸν Ἐλδυσνίας, καὶ ἄγεσι τῇ θεῷ τελετὴν τὰ ἐν Ἐλδυσνίῳ δρωμένα, καὶ ᾧ δα σφισι τὰ αὐτὰ φάσκοντες καθέστηκέναι. Παρὰ δὲ τῷ Ἐλδυσνίῳ τὸ ἱερὸν πεποιήσιν Πέτρωμα καλόμενοι ΔΙΘΟΙ ΔΥΟ ἡγεμόνες πρὸς ἀλλήλους, μεγάλοι. ἄγοντες δὲ ᾧ δα ἔτος ἦν τινα τελετὴν μείζονα οἰομένους, τῆς λίθους τῆς τῆς τῆς κῶτα ἀνοίγῃσι, λαβόντες γραμμάτια ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἔχοντα τὰ ἐς τὴν τελετὴν, καὶ ἀναγινόντες ἐπήκουον τῶ μυστῶν, κατέθετο ἐν κυτὶ αὐθις τῇ αὐτῇ. *Pausanias Arcadicis.*

^r Senex comissimus duxit me protinus ad ipsas foras Ædis amplissimæ, ritumque solenni asperfusionis celebrato Mysterio, ac matutino peracto Sacrificio de Opertis Adyti profert quosdam liberos, literis ignorabilibus prænotatos; partim FIGURIS CUIUSCEMODI ANIMALIUM, CONCEPTI SERMONIS COMPENDIOSA VERBA SUGGERENTES, partim nodosis, & in modum rotæ tortuosif, capreolatimque condensif apicibus, à curiositate profanorum lectione munita. *Metamorph.* lib. 11. This Engraving on *Stone Tables* seems to have been the old *Egyptian* Method of recording their sacred Laws. And this will give some Account for the *Israelites* receiving their Moral Law from God in this manner: For it will be shewn, hereafter, that many *Egyptian* Customs, not liable to be abused to Superstition, were indulged that People, in compliance to the strong Bias that Use and Habit induce upon the Mind: As on the other hand, that those, that were liable to be thus abused, were guarded against by direct contrary Institutions. And it is observable, that in the other, which were indulged, there was always something changed, in the application, that served as a Mark of Opposition, to distinguish them from their Original: So in this Case, *Stone Tables* were used by the *Egyptians* to write their secret Laws upon in their Mysteries, in unknown Characters, which they called the sacred: But God applied them to the Use of public Laws, plainly written, and openly promulged to all.

common

common Original to all the *Grecian* Mysteries can clear up and reconcile the Differences that arose amongst the *Grecian* States and Cities, concerning the Original of the Mysteries; every one claiming to be Original to the rest. Thus *Thrace* pretended that they came first from thence; *Crete* contested this Honour with those Barbarians; and *Athens* claimed it from both. And at that time, when they had forgot the true Original, it was impossible to settle and accommodate Matters: for each could easily prove he did not borrow them from those who contested with him: and at the same time, seeing a Similitude in the Rites, concluded they must have borrowed from it. But the owning one common Original, *Egypt*, clears up all the Difficulty; by accounting for that common Likeness, that gave birth to every one's Pretensions.

Now in *Egypt* all religious Worship being formed and propagated by Statesmen, and directed to Political Ends; we must conclude, that the Mysteries were originally invented by Legislators.

2. The Sages who brought them out of *Egypt*, and propagated them in *Asia*, in *Greece*, and *Britain*, were all Kings or Legislators; such as *Zoroaster*, *Inachus*, *Orpheus*, *Melampus*, *Trophonius*, *Minos*, *Cinyras*, *Erethheus*, and the Druids.

3. The State presided in the Mysteries: So in the *Eleusinian* she was represented by a President, intitled ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ; in memory, doubtless, of the first Founder: to whom were joined four Officers, chose by the People, called ΕΠΙΜΕΛΗΤΑΙ or Curators^f: the Priests were only Under Officers to these, and had no Share in the Direction: For this being the Legislator's favourite Institution, he took

^f See *Meursii Eleusinia*, c. 15.

all possible care for its Support ; which could not be done more effectually, than by presiding over it himself. But on the other hand, his interfering too openly in religious Matters would have defeated his End : for they would then soon come to be regarded by the People, rather as Utilities than Truths ; on which account, he carefully kept behind the Curtain : For though it now appears so fully that the Mysteries were the Invention of the State ; yet it is a Truth that was, generally, lost, even to the learned amongst them : which therefore occasioned this part of Antiquity to become miserably embroiled. The Reader may see by the second Chapter of *Meursius's Eleusinia*, how much the Ancients were at a loss for the true Founder of those Mysteries : some giving the Honour to *Ceres* ; some to *Triptolemus* ; others to *Eumolpus* ; others to *Museus* ; and some again to *Eretheus*. Now how shall we disengage ourselves from this Labyrinth, into which *Meursius* has led us, and wherein the Ancients keep us inclosed ? The Clue we have given will conduct us safely. We say, that *Eretheus*, King of *Athens*, instituted the Mysteries ; but that the People unluckily confounded the Institutor with the Priests, *Eumolpus* and *Museus*, who first officiated in the Rites ; and, with *Ceres* and *Triptolemus*, the Deities, in whose Honour they were celebrated. And these Mistakes were natural enough : for the Poets would be apt, in their licentious figurative Stile, to call the Gods, in whose Name the Mysteries were performed, the *Founders* of those Mysteries ; and the People, seeing only the Ministry of the officiating Priests (the Legislator keeping out of sight) in good earnest believed *them* to be the Founders. And yet, if it

† And so says *Diodorus Siculus*, l. i. Bibl.

was reasonable to expect, from Poets, or People, Attention to their own Opinions, and Imaginations, one would expect, they might have distinguished rightly, in this Matter, by the Help of that Mark, which *Eretheus* left behind him, to ascertain his Title; namely, the Erection of that Officer mentioned above, called *Βασιλεύς* or King.

4. Again, this Original is farther seen from the Qualities required in the Aspirants to the Mysteries: For, according to their original Institution, neither Slaves nor Foreigners were to be admitted into them. Now if the Mysteries were instituted, primarily, for the sake of teaching Religious Truths, no good Reason can be given why every Man, with the necessary moral Qualifications before mentioned, should not be admitted: But supposing them instituted by the State for political Ends, there may; for Slaves and Foreigners have, there, no Concern, no Property, no Country. When afterwards the *Greeks*, by frequent Confederations against the common Enemy of their Liberties, the *Persians*, began to consider themselves as one People and Community, the Mysteries were extended to all those who spoke the *Greek Language*: Yet the Ancients themselves, not reflecting upon the Original and End of their Institution, were much puzzled for the Reasons of this Confinement. *Lucian* tells us, in the Life of his Friend, *Demonax*, that that great Philosopher had the Courage, one day, to ask the *Athenians* why they excluded Barbarians from their Mysteries, when *Eumolpus*, a barbarous *Thracian*, had instituted them^u: But he does not tell us what Answer

^u Ἐτόλμησε δὲ πάλαι καὶ Ἀθηναῖος ἐρωτῆσαι δημοσίᾳ, τί πορρώσεως ἀκόσαι, διὰ τίνα αἰτίαν ἀποκλείειν τὸς βαρβάρους καὶ ταῦτα, ἃ τὴ τελετῇ αὐτοῖς καθίστασαν Ἐυμόλπου, βαρβάρου καὶ Θρακικοῦ οἴου.

they gave him. One of the greatest of the modern Critics was as much at a loss for the true Reason; and therefore thinks the Restraint ridiculous, as implying, that the Institutors imagined, the speaking the *Greek Tongue* contributed to the Advancement of Piety^w.

5. Another Proof of this Original may be deduced from what was taught, promiscuously, to all the Initiated: Which was *the necessity of a virtuous and holy Life, to obtain a happy Immortality*. Now this we know could not come from the Sacerdotal Warehouse: The Priests could afford Elysium better cheap, at the easy Expence of Oblations, Rites, and Sacrifices: For, as our great Philosopher, with equal Truth and Eloquence, observes, “The Priests made it not their business to teach
“the People Virtue: If they were diligent in their
“Observations and Ceremonies, punctual in their
“Feasts and Solemnities, and the Tricks of Religion, the holy Tribe assured them that the
“Gods were pleased, and they looked no farther:
“Few went to the Schools of Philosophers to be
“instructed in their Duty, and to know what was
“good and evil in their Actions: The Priests
“sold the better Pennyworths, and therefore had
“all the Custom: for Lustrations and Sacrifices
“were much easier than a clean Conscience and
“a steady Course of Virtue; and an expiatory
“Sacrifice, that atoned for the Want of it,
“much more convenient than a strict and holy

^w Auctor est Libanius in Corinthiorum actione, Mystagogos summa diligentia initiandos ante omnia monuisse, ut manus puras animumque sibi servarent purum: καὶ τὸ φωνὴν Ἑλλήνας εἶναι; & ut in voce sive sermone Græcos se præstarent: hoc quidem profecto ridiculum; quasi faceret ad veram pietatem, Græca potius quam alia lingua loqui. Is. Casauboni Exercit. xvi. ad annales Eccl. Baron.

“Life^x.” Now we may be assured, that an Institution, which taught the Necessity of a strict and holy Life, must be the Invention of Legislators, to whose Schemes Virtue was so necessary.

6. Another strong Presumption, that the Mysteries had this Original, is the infinite use they were of to the State: so amply confessed by the wisest Writers of Antiquity, produced above; and so clearly seen from the Nature of the Thing itself.

7. But lastly, we have for it the express Testimony of *Plutarch*, the most learned of all Writers in the Antiquities of *Greece*; who in his Treatise of *Isis* and *Osiris* delivers himself in this manner: — *This therefore is a most ancient Opinion delivered down from LEGISLATORS and Divines to Poets and Philosophers, the Author of it entirely unknown, but the Belief of it indelibly established, not only in Tradition and the Talk of the Vulgar, but in the MYSTERIES and in the sacred Offices of Religion, both amongst Greeks and Barbarians, spread all over the Face of the Globe, that the Universe is not upheld fortuitously, without Mind, Reason, or a Governor to preside over its Revolutions^y.*

It is now submitted to the Reader, whether the Mysteries are not fairly proved to have been invented by the Legislator, to affirm and establish the general Doctrine of a Providence, by inculcating the Belief of a future State of Rewards and Punishments.

^x *Locke's Reasonableness of Christianity.* He appears not. to have been aware of this extraordinary Institution for the Support of Virtue.

^y Διὸ καὶ παντάλας αὐτῇ, κάτεσσιν ἐκ θεολόγων καὶ ΝΟΜΟΘΕΤΩΝ ἥσπερ ποιητῶν καὶ φιλοσόφων ὁμοῦ, τὸ δεῦρον ἀδίσποστον ἔχουσα, τὸ ὅτι πῶς ἰσχυρὰ καὶ δυσεξάλειπτον, ἐκ ἐν λόφοις μόνον, εἰδὲ ἐν φημαῖς, ἀλλὰ ἐν τε ΤΕΛΕΤΑΙΣ, ἐν τε θυσίαις, καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ἑκκλησίᾳ παραλαβὴν περιεργμμένην, ὡς ἂν αὐτὴν καὶ ἀλλοῖν ὅτε ἀπεδείκνυσθαι αἰωρεῖται τῷ αὐτομάτῳ τὸ πᾶν, —

And if we may believe a certain Ancient, who appears to have been well versed in them, they gained their End, by clearing up all Doubts concerning the righteous Government of the Gods².

Our Subject having necessarily engaged us in a large historical Account of the *Mysteries*; yet the Form of the Discourse not affording us an Opportunity hitherto to take notice of the *Shews and Representations* exhibited therein, one of the most important Parts of the *Mysteries*, and the only one remaining unspoken to; *Virgil*, in affording us a fresh Proof of the Sentiments of the best and wisest amongst the Ancients, concerning the Service of the Doctrine of a future State to Society, will give us the Opportunity we sought for: So that nothing will now be wanting to a thorough Intelligence of this curious and interesting Circumstance of Antiquity.

We hope then to make it very evident, that the Master-piece of the *Æneis*, the famous sixth Book, is nothing else but a Description, and so designed by the Author, of his Hero's Initiation into the Mysteries of one Part of the ELEUSINIAN SPECTACLES; where every thing was done in Shew and Machinery; and where a Representation of the History of *Ceres* afforded Opportunity of bringing in the Scenes of Heaven, Hell, Elysium, Purgatory, and all that related to the future State of Men and Heroes.

But to make this, which hath at first sight so much the air of a Paradox, the less shocking, it will not be improper to enquire into the Nature of the *Æneis*.

² Ο ὃ πῆρ' ἑκαστὸς ἐκαστὸς αἰσθάνεσθαι δ' ἀγαθὰ καὶ κακά, καὶ πρὸς τὰς τελευταίας αἰτίας ἀσπίσαι καὶ δεσποδῆσαν γενόμεθα, πρὸς δὲ τὸν ἐπὶ τῷ αἰσθάνεσθαι τὸν αἰσθάνεσθαι ἀμφότερον. Sopater in Diogeni. quaest.

Homer's two Poems had each a plain simple Story, to convey as simple a Moral; and in this kind he is justly esteemed admirable. *Virgil* could make no Improvements here: His Master was compleat and perfect; so that the Patrons of the *Roman* Poet, and even *Scaliger* himself, are confined to seek for his superior Advantages in his Episodes, Descriptions, Similies, and in the Chastity and Correction of his Thoughts and Diction; while all have overlooked the greatest Advantage he had over him. He found the Epic Poem in Possession of the first Rank of human Compositions; but this did not satisfy his large Views: He was not content that its Subject should be to instruct the World in Morals, much less in Physics, which was the ridiculous Imagination of some Ancients, though he was fond of those Enquiries, but aspired to make it a *System of Politics*. Accordingly, the *Æneis* is indeed as much such in Verse, by *Example*, as the Republics of *Plato* and *Tully* were in Prose, by *Precepts*. Thus he advanced the Epic to a new State of Perfection; and, as *Paterculus* says of *Menander*, — *inveniebat, neque imitandum relinquebat*. For though every one saw that *Augustus* was shadowed in the Person of *Æneas*, yet imagining those political Instructions, which were for the Service of Mankind, to be designed for the sole Use of the Emperor, they missed of its true Nature: And in this Ignorance, the succeeding Epic Writers, following a Poem, whose Genius they did not understand, wrote worse than if they had only taken *Homer*, and his simple Plan, for their Guides. A great modern Poet, and best Judge of their Merit, assures us of the Fact; and what we have said explains the Cause of it: *The other Epic Poets*, says this justly admired Writer, *have used the same Practice* (that of *Virgil*, of running two Fables into

one) but generally carried it so far as to superinduce a Multiplicity of Fables, destroy the Unity of Action, and lose their Readers in an unreasonable Length of Time^a.

Such was the Revolution *Virgil* brought about in this noblest Region of Poetry; an Improvement so great, that the sublimest Genius had need of all the Assistance the best Poet could lend him: And nothing less than the joint Aid of the *Iliad* and *Odyssees* could furnish out the Execution of his great Idea: for a System of Politics, delivered in the Example of a great Prince, must shew him in every public Circumstance of Life. Hence was *Aeneas*, of Necessity, to be found voyaging with *Ulysses*, and fighting with *Achilles*: And I am persuaded, that great Admirer of *Virgil*, and best Imitator of his Correctness, last quoted, will be pleased to find this the Case, rather than that which he assigns for his Master's Conduct, in the following Words: *Virgil, for want of so warm a Genius, aided himself by taking in a more extensive Subject, as well as a greater Length of Time, and contracting the Design of both Homer's Poems into one*^b.

But if the improved Nature of his Subject necessitated him to violate that Simplicity in the Fable, which *Aristotle*, and his Interpreter *Bossu*, find so divine in *Homer*^c; he gained considerable Advantages by it in other Circumstances of the Composition: For now, those Ornaments and Decorations, for whose Insertion the Critics could give no other Reasons than the raising the Dignity of the

^a Preface to the *Iliad* of *Homer*.

^b See the same Preface.

^c Nous ne trouverons point, dans la Fable de l' Eneide, cette Simplicité qu' Aristote a trouvée si divine dans Homère. *Traite du Poeme Epique*, l. 1. c. 11.

Poem, become necessarily inherent in the Subject. Thus the Choice of Princes and Heroes for Actors of the Scene, which were before only to grace it, now constitute the Essence of the Poem^d: And the Machinery and Intervention of the Gods, on every Occasion, which were to create the *marvelous*, become, in this Improvement, an indispensable Part of the Action. It is in the very Spirit of ancient Legislation, as we find in the Beginning of this Book, where we see the Principal Care of the Lawgiver was to possess the People with the Belief of a Providence. This then is the true Reason of so much Machinery in the *Æneis*: for which modern Critics accuse the Poet of Want of Judgment; as following *Homer* too closely in a Poem wrote in the polite and enlightened Age of *Rome*^e. An excellent Writer, and one who ought never to be mentioned but with Terms of the highest Esteem, speaking of the *Marvelous* in *Virgil*: says, *If there be any Instance in the Æneid liable to Exception upon this account, it is in the Beginning of the third Book, where Æneas is represented as tearing up the Myrtle that dropped Blood. This Circumstance seems to have the Marvelous without the Probable, because it is represented as proceeding from natural Causes without*

^d — Le retour (says *Bossu*) d'un homme en sa maison, & la querelle de deux autres, n'ayant rien de grand en soi, deviennent des actions illustres & importantes, lorsque dans le choix des noms, le Poete dit que c'est Ulyssé qui retourne en Ithaque, & que c'est Achille & Agamemnon qui querellent — He goes on, — Mais il y a des Actions qui d'elles mêmes sont tres importantes, comme l'*etablissement*, ou la *ruïne d'un etat*, ou d'une *Religion*. Telle est donc l'action de l' *Eneide*, l. 2. c. 19. He saw here a remarkable Difference in the Subjects: it is strange this should not have led him to see that the *Æneis* is of a different Species.

^e Ce qui est beau dans *Homère* pourroit avoir été mal reçu dans les ouvrages d'un Poète du tems d'*Auguste*. *Idem ib.* l. 3. c. 8. *De l'admirable*.

the Interposition of any God, or rather, supernatural Power capable of producing it^f. But when this amiable Writer made this Remark, he appears not to have recollected what *Æneas* says on the Occasion :

“ Nymphas venerabar agrestes,
 “ Grandivumque patrem, Geticis qui præsidet
 “ arvis,
 “ Rite secundarent visus, omenque levarent.

Now these kind of Omens, for there were two sorts, were always supposed to be produced by the Intervention of a supernatural Power. So when the *Roman* Historians relate, that it *rained Blood*, the Omen was the same. And the Poet was certainly within the Bounds of the *Probable*, while he told no more than what the gravest Historians recorded in every Page of their Annals. But this was not done to make us stare. He is, as we observe, in a legislative Capacity, and writes to possess the People of the Interposition of the Gods, in Omens, and Prodigies ; which was in the Method of the old Law-givers. So *Plutarch*, as quoted above, tells us that *with Divinations and OMENS*, *Lycurgus sanctified the Lacedemonians*, *Numa the Romans*, *Ion the Athenians*, and *Deucalion all the Greeks in general* ; and by *Hopes and Fears kept up in them the Awe and Reverence of Religion*. The Scene of this Adventure is laid with the utmost Propriety on the uncivilized, inhospitable Shores of *Thrace*, to inspire Horror for barbarous Manners, and an Inclination and Appetite for Civil Policy.

As the not taking the true Scope of the *Æneis*, has occasioned Mistakes, to *Virgil's* Disadvantage,

^f Mr. Addison's Works, Vol. 3. p. 316. Quarto Ed. 1721.

concerning the Plan and Conduct of the Poem ; so hath it likewise concerning the Characters. The Piety of *Æneas*, and his high Veneration for the Gods, so much offends a celebrated *French* Writer^s, that he says, *the Hero was fitter to found a Religion than a Monarchy*. But he did not know, that the Image of a perfect Law-giver is held out to us in *Æneas* ; and had he known that, he had perhaps been ignorant, that it was the Office of such to found *Religions*, as well as *States*. And that *Virgil* tells us this was his,

*Dum conderet Urbem,
Inferretque Deos Latio —*

But his Humanity offends our Critic as much as his Piety, and he calls him a mere *St. Swithin*, always raining. The Beauty of this Representation escaped him. It was necessary to shew a perfect Law-giver touched with all the Affections of Humanity ; and the Example was the more to be inculcated, because we experience vulgar Politicians, but too much divested of these common Notices. Nor is the View, in which we place this Poem, less serviceable in the Vindication of his other Characters. The Learned Author of the *Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer*, will forgive me for differing from him, in thinking that that Uniformity of Manners in the *Æneis*, was the Effect of Design, not of Custom and Habit. *Virgil*, says he, *had seen much of the Splendor of a Court, the Magnificence of a Palace, and the Grandeur of a Royal Equipage: Accordingly his Representations of that Part of Life, are more august and stately than Homer's. He has a greater Regard to Decency, and those polished Manners, that render Men so much*

^s Monsieur De St. Evremont.

of a piece, and make them all resemble one another in their Conduct and Behaviour^b. For this Work being a System of Politics, the Eternity of a Government, the Form of a Magistrature, and Plan of Dominion being, as this fine Writer observes, familiar with the Roman Poet, nothing could be more to his Purpose, than this Representation of polished Manners: It being the Legislator's Office to tame and break Men to Humanity; and to make them disguise at least, if they cannot be brought to lay aside their Savage Manners.

But this Key to the *Æneis* not only clears up a great many Passages obnoxious to the Critics, but adds an infinite Beauty to a vast Number of Incidents throughout the whole Poem. Permit me only to observe, before I conclude this Paragraph, that this was the *second Species* of the Epic Poem. Our own Countryman, the great *Milton*, produced the *third*. For just as *Virgil* rivaled *Homer*, so *Milton* emulated both. He found *Homer* possessed of the Province of *Morality*; *Virgil* of *Politics*; and nothing left for him, but that of *Religion*. This he seized, as aspiring to share with them in the Government of the poetic World. And, by Means of the superior Dignity of his Subject, got to the Head of that triumvirate which took so many Ages in forming. These are the *three Species* of the Epic Poem; for its largest Province is *human Action*, which can be considered but in a *moral*, a *political*, or *religious* View; and these the three great *Creators* of them; for each of these Poems was struck out at a Heat, and came to Perfection from its first Essay. Here then the grand Scene is closed, and all further Improvements of the Epic at an End.

It being granted then, that the *Æneis* is in the Stile of ancient Legislation ; it is hard to think so great a Master in his Art, would overlook a Doctrine, that, we have shewn, to be the Foundation and Support of ancient Politics ; namely that of a future State of Rewards and Punishments. Accordingly, in Imitation of his Models, *Plato* and *Tully*, in their *Vision of Erus*, and *Dream of Scipio*, he hath given us a compleat System of it. Again, as the Legislator took care to support this Doctrine by a very extraordinary Institution, and commemorated it therein, with all the Pomp of Spectacle ; we cannot but confess a Description of those shews would add a peculiar Grace and Elegance to the Poem : And that the Pomp and Solemnity of the Representations would be apt to invite him to attempt it, as affording Matter for all the Embellishments of poetical Description. Accordingly we say, he hath done this likewise. And, that the Descent of *Æneas* into Hell, is no other than an enigmatical Representation of his Initiation into the Mysteries.

Virgil, in this Poem, was to represent a perfect Legislator, in the Person of *Æneas* ; but Initiation into the Mysteries was what sanctified his Character and Function. For it was no Wonder that he should endeavour by his own Example, to enoble an Institution that was of his own creating : Accordingly all the ancient Heroes and Legislators were Initiated.

While the Mysteries were confined to their native Country *Egypt*, and while the *Grecian* Legislators went thither for Initiation, as a Kind of Consecration to their Office ; the Ceremony would naturally be spoken of in high Allegorical Terms. The Genius of the *Egyptian* Manners partly contributed to it ; much more, the Humour of Travel-

lers; but most of all, the Arts of Legislators; who, returning into their own Country, to civilize a barbarous People by Laws and Arts, found it very profitable for themselves, and necessary for the People, in order to raise their own Characters, and to establish the fundamental Principle of a future State, to represent, that Initiation, in which they saw the State of departed Mortals represented in Machinery, as an actual Descent into Hell. This did *Orpheus*, *Bacchus*, and others. And this Way of speaking continued even after the Mysteries were introduced into *Greece*, as appears by the Fables of *Hercules's* and *Theseus's* Descent into Hell. But the Allegory generally carried something with it that discovered the Truth conveyed under it. So *Orpheus* is said to get to Hell by the Power of his Harp: *Threïcia fretus cithara fidibusque canoris*: which plainly declares it to be in Quality of Legislator: The Harp being the known Symbol of his Laws, by which he humanized a rude and barbarous People. Again, in the Life of *Hercules*, we have the true History, and the Fable founded on it, recorded together. For we are told, that *Hercules* was in Fact initiated into the *Eleusinian* Mysteries; and that this was just before his eleventh Labour of bringing *Cerberus* from Hell: And the Scholiast on *Homer* suggests that the Initiation was designed as a Security in that desperate Attempt. Both *Euripides* and *Aristophanes* seem to confirm our Interpretation of this Descent into Hell. *Euripides*, in his *Hercules furens*, brings the Hero, just come from Hell, to succour his Family, and destroy the Tyrant *Lycus*. In Revenge of this, *Juno* persecutes him with the Furies; and, in his Rage, he kills his Wife and Children, mistaking them for Enemies. When he comes to himself, he is consoled by his Friend *Theseus*; who would excuse him

him by the criminal Examples of the Gods: A Thing, which, as I have observed above, mightily encouraged the People in their Irregularities; and was therefore provided against in the Mysteries, by the Detection of the Errors of Polytheism. Now *Euripides* seems plainly enough to have told us what he thought of the fabulous Descents into Hell, by making *Hercules* reply like one just come from the Celebration of the Mysteries, and entrusted with the *ὑπόμνημα*. *The Examples*, says he, *which you bring of the Gods, are nothing to the Purpose. I cannot think them guilty of the Crimes imputed to them. I cannot apprehend how one God can be the Sovereign of another God. — A God who is truly so, stands in need of no one. Reject we then these ridiculous Fables, which the Poets teach concerning them.* The Comic Poet, in his *Frogs*, hath shewn us plainly what he understood by the ancient Hero's Descent into Hell, in the Equipage he gives *Bacchus*, when he brings him enquiring the Way of *Hercules*. We are to observe then, that it was the Custom, as we are told by the Scholiast on the Place, at the Celebration of the *Eleusinian* Mysteries, to have what was wanted in those Rites, carried on Asses. Hence the Proverb, *Asinus portat Mystera*: Accordingly the Poet introduces *Bacchus*, followed by his buffoon Servant *Xanthius*, bearing a Bundle in like Manner, and riding on an Ass. And lest the Meaning of this should be mistaken, on *Hercules's* telling *Bacchus* that the Inhabitants of *Elysium* were the Initiated, *Xanthius* puts in, and says, *and I am the Ass carrying Mysteries.*

Here then, as was the Case in many other of the ancient Fables, the Pompousness of the Expression betrayed willing Posterity into the Miraculous. But why need we wonder at it, in the Genius of ancient Times, which delighted to tell the commonest

most Things in a highly figurative and uncommon Manner; when a Writer of so late an Age as *Apuleius*, either in Imitation of Antiquity, or rather according to the received Phraseology of the Mysteries, describes his Initiation in this Manner: *Accessi confinium mortis; & calcato Proserpinæ limine, per omnia vêtus elementa remeavi: nocte media vidi solem candido coruscantem lumine: Deos inferos & Deos superos accessi coram, & adoravi de proximo*¹. *Aeneas* could not describe his Night's Journey after he had been let out of the Ivory Gate, to his Companions in other Terms.

We see then, *Virgil* was obliged to have his Hero initiated; and that he had the Authority of fabulous Antiquity to call this Initiation a Descent into Hell. And surely he made use of his Advantage with great Judgment; for this Fiction animates the Relation, that delivered without an Allegory, had been too cold and flat for the Epic Poem.

But an old Poem, under the Name of *Orpheus*, intituled, *A Descent into Hell*, was it now existing, would, perhaps, have shewn us, that no more was meant than *Orpheus's* Initiation; and that the Idea of this sixth Book was taken from thence. However this be, *Servius* saw thus far into *Virgil's* Design, as to say, there were *multa per altam scientiam Theologicorum Ægyptiorum*: And we have shewn that the Doctrines taught in the Mysteries, were invented by them. But though I say this was our Poet's general Design, I would not be supposed to think he followed no other Guides. Several of the Episodes are borrowed from *Homer*; and several of the Philosophic Notions from *Plato*: Some of which will be taken Notice of in their place.

¹ L. II. prope finem.

We have observed, that the Initiated had a Guide or Conductor, called ἱεροφάντης, Μυσαγωγός, ἱερεὺς, indifferently of either Sex, who was to instruct him in the preparatory Ceremonies, and lead him to, and explain the Shews and Spectacles. Accordingly, *Virgil* hath given *Æneas* the Sibyl; whom he calls *Vates*, magna Sacerdos, & docta Comes, Words of equivalent Signification. And as the She Mystagogue was devoted to a single Life^k, so was the *Cumæan* Sibyl.

The first Instruction the Prophetess gives *Æneas*, is to search for the *Golden Bough*, sacred to *Proserpine*,

“ Aureus & foliis & lento vimine ramus,
“ Junoni infernæ sacer.

Servius can make nothing of this Circumstance. He supposes it might possibly allude to a Tree in the Middle of the sacred Grove of *Diana's* Temple in *Greece*: where, if a Fugitive came for Sanctuary, and could get off a Branch from this Tree, which was carefully guarded by the Priests, he had the Honour to go to Handy-cuffs with one of them, and, if he overcame him, to take his Place. Though nothing can be more foreign to the Point in Question than this rambling Stuff, yet the *Abbe Banier*, the best Interpreter of the Fables of the Ancients, is forced, for want of a better, to take up with this Solution^l, after *Servius*. Now we say, that under this Branch is obumbrated the *Wreath of Myrtle*, with which the Initiated were crowned at the Celebration of the Mysteries^m. 1. Because the

^k Hierophanta apud *Athenas* evitat virum, et æterna debilitate fit castus. *Hieron. ad Geron. de Monogamia.*

^l *Explicat. Histor. des Fables*, vol. 2. p. 133. Ed. 1715.

^m Μυστικός στέφανος ἱερειῶν τοῦ μυστηρίου. *Schol. Aristoph. Ranis.*

Golden Bough is said to be sacred to *Proserpine*, and so we see was the *Myrtle*: *Proserpine* only without *Ceres* is mentioned all the Way throughout; partly because the Initiation is described as an actual Descent into Hell; but principally because, when the *Rites* of the Mysteries were performed, then *Ceres* and *Proserpine* were equally invoked; but when the *Shewes* were represented, then *Proserpine* alone presided: But this Book is only a Representation of the Shews of the Mysteries. 2. The Quality of this *Golden Bough*, with its *lento vimine*, admirably describes the *tender Branches of Myrtle*. 3. The Doves of *Venus* are made to direct *Æneas* to the Tree:

“Tum Maximus Heros

“*Maternas agnoscit aves.* —

They fly to it, and rest upon it, as on an accustomed Perch, belonging to the Family: A Place where they loved to be: For the Myrtle was consecrated to *Venus*, as every one knows.

“*Sedibus optatis gemina super arbore fidunt.*

But there is a greater Propriety and Beauty in this Conduct, than appears at first View. For not only the Myrtle was dedicated to *Proserpine* as well as *Venus*, but the Doves likewise, as *Porphyrus* informs usⁿ.

Æneas having got this Bough, or being crowned with Myrtle, the Poet tells us he carried it into the Sibyl's Grov:

“Et vatis portat sub tecta Sibyllæ.

ⁿ Τὴν δὲ φωνήν αὐτῶν, ὅτι τὸ πρῶτον ἔσονται, ὅταν οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἱεροῦ γὰρ αὐτῶν ἡ φωνή. *Porph. de Abst.* l. 4. § 16.

And

And this was to design Initiation into the *lower Mysteries*: For *Dion Chrysostom*^o tells us, this was done ἐν ὀλίμῳ καὶ μικρῷ, in a little narrow Chapel, as we must suppose the Sibyl's Grot to be. The Initiated into these were called Μύσται.

He is then led by the Sibyl, his Myflagogue, to the Scene of the Descent.

“ *His actis, propere exequitur præcepta Sibyllæ.*

And this signifies his Initiation into the *greater Mysteries*, where the Initiated are now called Ἐπίπται. The Time was the Night, as in the Mysteries. And the Place like that, in which, *Dion* tells us, the *greater Mysteries* were celebrated; a *Mystic Dome*, excelling in *Grandeur and Magnificence*?

“ *Spelunca alia fuit, castroque immanis biatu*

“ *Scrupea, tuta lacu nigro nemorumque tenebris.*

His Reception is thus described :

“ *Sub pedibus mugire solum & juga cœpta moveri*

“ *Sylvarum ; visæque canes ululare per umbram,*

“ *Adventante Dea. Procul ô, procul este, profani,*

“ *Conclamat vates, totoque absistite luo.*

How true a Description this was of the Opening of the Shews in the Mysteries, may be seen by the fine Description which *Claudian* *professedly and without Disguise* makes of the Entrance into these tremendous Rites, where he counterfeits the Raptures and Astonishment of one of the Initiated, and throws himself, as it were, like the Sibyl into the midst of the Scene.

“ *Furens antro se immisit aperto.*

^o Orat. 12.

Ρ — Μύσται αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς ΜΥΣΤΙΚὸΝ τὴν ΟΙΚΟΝ, ὑΠΕΡΦΥΗ ΚΑΛΛΕΙ & ΜΕΓΕΘΕΙ. *Ibid.*

Thus he breaks out :

- “ *Greffus removete, Profani,*
 “ *Jam furor humanos nostro de pectore sensus*
 “ *Expulit ———*
 “ *Jam mihi cernuntur trepidis delubra moveri*
 “ *Sedibus, & claram dispergere fulmina lucem,*
 “ *Adventum testata Dei. Jam magnus ab imis*
 “ *Auditur fremitus terris, templumque remugit*
 “ *Cecropium; sanctasque faces attollit ELEUSIN;*
 “ *Angues Triptolemi stridunt, & squamea curvis*
 “ *Colla levant ———*
 “ *Ecce procul ternas Hecate variata figuras*
 “ *Exoritur* ⁹.

And how exactly both Descriptions agree to the Relations the ancient Greek Writers have left us of these Things, may be seen from the general View *Dion Chrysostom* gives us of Initiation in these Words: *Just so it is as when one leads a Greek or Barbarian to be initiated in a certain mystic Dome, excelling in Beauty and Magnificence; where he sees many mystic Sights, and hears in the same Manner a Multitude of Voices; where Darknes and Light alternately affect his Senses; and a Thousand other uncommon Things present themselves before him*’.

The *visæque canes ululare per umbram*, is clearly explained by *Pletho* in his Scholia to the magic Oracles of Zoroaster: *It is the Custom in the Celebration of the Myteries, to present before many of the Initiated, Phantasms of a canine Figure, and other*

⁹ *De Raptu Proserp. sub initio.*

[†] Σχεδόν ἐν ὁμοίᾳ, ὡς εἰ τις ἄνθρωπος Ἑλλήνα, ἢ Βάρβαρον μυσταγωγῶν εἰς μυστικὸν τοιαύτου οἴκου, ὑπερφυῆ καὶ κατὰ τὴν μεγέθει, πολλὰ μὲν ὁρῶντα μυστικὰ διαμάνη, πολλὰ δὲ ἀκρόασι τοιούτων φωνῶν, σκότους τε καὶ φωτός· ἐν αὐτῷ φαινομένων, ἄλλαν τε μυρίων γυνωμένων. Orat. 12.

*monstrous Shapes and Appearances*¹. The PROCL, ô PROCUL ESTE PROFANI of the Sibyl, is a literal Translation of the Formulary used by the Mystagogue, at the Opening of the Mysteries :

ΕΚΑΣ, ΕΚΑΣ ΕΣΤΕ ΒΕΒΗΛΟΙ.

The Sibyl then bids *Æneas* arm himself with all his Courage, as being to encounter most dreadful Appearances :

“ Tuque invade viam, vaginâque eripe ferrum :

“ Nunc animis opus, *Ænea*, nunc pectore firmo.

And we soon find the Hero in a Fright :

“ Corripit hic subitâ trepidus formidine ferrum

“ *Æneas*, strictamque aciem venientibus offert.

And thus affected is the Initiated represented to be by the Ancients, on his Entrance into these Rites. *Entring now into the mystic Dome, says Themistius, he is filled with Horror and Amazement. He is seized with Solicitude, and a total Perplexity. He is unable to move a Step forward, or how to begin right the Road that is to lead him to the Place he aspires to. Till the Prophet (the Vates) or Conductor laying open the Vestibule of the Temple*¹. — So Proclus : *As in the most holy Mysteries, before the Scene of the mystic Visions, there is a Terror infused over the Minds of the Initiated; so, &c*”. And we presently see what

¹ Εἰσθε τοῖς πολλοῖς τῶν τελεμῶν φαίνεσθαι καὶ ταῖς τελεταῖς κυνώθη τινα, καὶ ἄλλως ἀλλόκοτα καὶ μορφαὶ φάσματα.

² Ὁ μὲν ἄρτι παρσίων τοῖς ἀδύτοις, θείας τε ἀνεπίμπτου καὶ ἰλνγῆ· ἀδμονία τε ἔιχετο καὶ ἀπειρία συμπαση, καὶ ἴχνης λαβεῖσθαι οἷοσε ὢν, ὅτε ἀρχῆς ἡσινσέν ἐπιδραξέσθαι ἔσω φειδύσης· ὁπότε ὁ ποιητὴς ἐκείνος ἀναπελάσας τὴν προπύλαια τῶν ἐνῶ. — Orat. in Patrem.

³ Ὡς περ ἐν ταῖς ἀγιωτάταις τελεταῖς πρὸς τῶν μυσηῶν θεομάτων ἐκπληξίς τῶν μυκηδῶν, ὅτω — In Plat. Theol. l. 3. c. 18.

occasion'd it; for *Æreus* is now engaged amongst all the real and imaginary Evils of Life; all the Diseases of Mind and Body; all the *Terribiles vñe ferme*, the Centaurs, Scyllæ, Chimæra, Gorgons, and Harpies: And these are they which *Plato* in the Place quoted above, calls ἀλλόκοτα τὰς μορφαὶς φάσματα, as seen in the Entrance of the Mysteries. And which *Cælius* tells us were presented likewise in the *Bacchi* Rites*. These are said to be *Vestibulum ante ipsum*, and *Themistius* tells us that was the Scene of all the Terrors, τὰ προπύλαια τῶ νεώ.

On the Opening of this Scene, the Poet stops short in his Narration; and breaks out into this solemn Apology:

- “ Dii, quibus imperium est animarum, umbræque
 “ silentes;
 “ Et Chaos et Phlegethon loca nocte silentia late,
 “ Sit mihi fas audita loqui: sit numine vestro
 “ Pandere res altâ terrâ & caligineertas —

As conscious that he was about to engage in an impious kind of Undertaking, such as revealing the Mysteries was generally esteemed. *Claudian*, in the Poem taken Notice of before, who professes openly to treat of the *Eleusinian* Mysteries, at a Time when they were in little Veneration, yet in Compliance to old Custom, excuses his Undertaking in the very same Manner:

- “ Dii, quibus in numerum, &c. —
 “ Vos mihi sacrarum penetralia pandite rerum
 “ Et vestri secreta poli, qua lampade Ditem
 “ Illexit amor, quo ducta ferox *Proserpina* raptu
 “ Possulit dotale Chaos; quantasque per oras
 “ Sollicito genitrix erraverit anxia cursu.

* Τὸ ἐν ταῖς Βακχικαῖς τελεαῖς τὰ φασματὰ καὶ δαίμονα
 τῶν τελεῶν. Orig. cœc. C. 4. l. 4. p. 167.

“ Unde

“ Unde datæ populis leges, & glande relicta,
 “ Cesserit inventis *Dodonia* quercus arillis”.

Had the revealing the Myſteries been ſo penal at *Rome*, as it was in *Greece*, *Virgil* had never ventured on this Part of his Poem. But yet it was eſteemed an Impiety^y; therefore he does it covertly, and makes this Apology to thoſe who ſaw into his Meaning.

The Hero and his Guide now enter on their Journey :

“ Ibant obſcuri ſola ſub nocte per umbram :
 “ Perque domos Ditis vacuas, & inania reges.
 “ Quale per incertam lunam ſub luce maligna
 “ Eſt iter in ſylvis : ubi cœlum condidit umbrâ
 “ *Jupiter*, & rebus nox abſtulit atra colorem.

This Deſcription puts me in Mind of a Paſſage in *Lucian's* Dialogue of the Tyrant. As a Company, made up of every Condition of Life, are voyaging together into the other World; *Myceilus* breaks out, and ſays : — “ Bleſs us ! how dark it is. Where
 “ is now the beautiful *Myceilus*? Who can tell
 “ here whether *Simmiche* or *Phrya* be the hand-
 “ ſomer? *Everything is alike and of the ſame Colour*;
 “ and no Room for Compariſon. Nay my old
 “ Cloak, which but now preſented to your Eyes ſo
 “ irregular a Figure, is become as honourable a
 “ Wear, as his Maſteſty's Purple here. The
 “ Truth is, they are both vaniſhed, and retired
 “ together under the ſame Cover. But my Friend,

^z *De Raptu Proſerpine*, l. 1. ſub init.

^y — *Athenis* iniciatus [*Auguſtus*] cum poſtea *Roma* pro tribunali de privilegio ſacerdotum *Atica* *Cereri* cognoviſſet, & quedam ſecretiora proponerentur, diſmiſſo concilio & coram circumſtantium, ſolus audiit diſceptantes. *Sueton.* l. 2. *Oſcio.* *Aug.* c. 92.

“ the Cynic, where are you? give me your Hand :
 “ You are initiated in the Eleusinian Mysteries. Tell
 “ me now, do not you think this very like the blind
 “ March they make there. CY. Oh extremely : And
 “ look, here comes one of the Furies, as I guess, by
 “ her Equipage, with her Torch, and her terrible
 “ Looks”.

They come now to the Banks of *Cocytus*. *Æneas* is surprized at the Croud of Ghosts, that hover round it, and appear impatient for a Passage. He is told by his Guide, that they are such, whose Bodies have not the Rites of Sepulture ; and are therefore doomed to wander up and down for a Hundred Years, before they are permitted to cross it.

“ Hæc omnis, quam cernis, inops inhumataque
 “ turba est :

“ Portitor ille, *Charon* ; hi, quosvehit unda, sepulti.

“ Nec ripas datur horrendas, nec rauca fluentia

“ Transportare prius, quam sedibus ossa quierunt.

“ Centum errant annos, volitantque hæc litora cir-
 “ cum.

“ Tum demum admissi stagna exoptata revifunt.

But we are not to think this old Notion took its Birth from the superstitious Vulgar. The inculcat- ing it, was one of the wisest Contrivances of anci-

“ M1. Πράγμῃς δὲ ζήσῃ· πῶ γὰρ ὁ καλὸς Μέγιστος· ἢ τῷ διαγνώ τῃ; εὐλαβῆσαι αἱ καλλίσται Φρίξες Σιμωνίχη; πάντα γὰρ ἴσα, καὶ ἐμύχιστα, καὶ εἶδεν ὅτε καλὸν, ἥτε καλλίστην. ἀλλ’ ἦδη καὶ τὸ τελευ- τιστὸν, πρὸς τὴν πῶς ἀμάρτυρα καὶ δοκῶν, ἰσοτιμίαν γίνεσθαι τῇ πορφυ- ραίῃ τῇ βασιλικῇ· ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἄμφοι, καὶ κατὰ τῷ ἀνὴρ σκότῳ καλα- δευκίῳ. Κοινοῦ, σὺ δὲ πᾶς σὺν ἄρῃ ὅν τε γχαίεις; — εὐδαί- μοι δὲ δεξιὰν· εἰπέ μοι, ἐπελίσθῃ γὰρ ὡς Κίσις, τὰ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΑ, εἴ, ΟΜΟΙΑ τοῖς· εἰκὴ τὰ ἐνθάδε σὺ δοκεῖ; ΚΥΝ. δὲ λέγεις· ἴδῃ καὶ πορφυρεῖται δαδὰ χρυσά τῃ, φασγάνῳ τῇ, καὶ ἀπειλητικὸν πορφυ- ρολεπιδῶν. ἢ ἄρα πᾶς Ἐρμῆς ἴσῃ; *Lutiani Cataplas.*

ent Legislation. And that it came from this Forge, we have no Reason to doubt, because it was originally *Ægyptian*. Those profound Masters of Wisdom, in contriving for the Safety of their Fellow Citizens, found nothing would contribute more to it, than the public and solemn Interment of the Dead. For, without this Provision, private Murders might be easily and securely perpetrated. They therefore introduced the Custom of the most public and pompous Funeral Rites. And both *Herodotus* and *Diodorus Siculus* observe, that they were of all People the most circumstantially ceremonious in them. But, to secure the Observance, by the Force of Religion, as well as Custom, they taught that the deceased could not retire to a Place of rest in the other World, till these Rites were paid him in this. Which would necessarily enforce the most careful observance of them; whereby the Legislator gained his End, the Security of the People. And the Notion spread so wide, and fixed its Root so deep, that the Substance of the Superstition remains, even to this Day, in most civilized Countries. There is one Circumstance, which, if well considered, will shew us of how great Moment the Rites of Sepulture were thought by the Ancients. The three greatest of the *Greek* Poets are without Question, *Homer*, *Sophocles*, and *Euripides*. Now in the *Iliad*, the *Ajax*, and the *Phœnicians* there appears, in the Judgment of modern Critics, a vicious Continuation of the Story, that violates the Unity of the Action; in the Performance of sepulchral Rites for *Patroclus*, *Ajax*, and *Poly-nices*. But these Men did not consider, that the Ancients esteemed Funeral Rites to be an inseparable Part of the History of the Death of any one. And that therefore those great Masters of Unity
and

and Decorum, could not think the Action ended, 'till that important Circumstance was settled.

But the *Egyptian* Legislator found afterwards another Use in this Opinion; and, by artfully turning it as a Punishment on insolvent Debtors, grounded on it an Institution of great Advantage to Society. For, instead of that general Custom of modern Barbarians to bury insolvent Debtors *alive*, this polite and humane People had a Law that denied Burial to them when *dead*. And the Terror of this Punishment gained, as we are told, its desired effect. And here the Learned *Marsham* seems to be mistaken, when he supposes, that from this Interdiction of sepulchral Rites, sprung up the *Græcian* Opinion of the Wandering of unburied Ghosts^a. Whereas it is plain from the Nature of the Thing, that the Law was founded on the Opinion, which was *Egyptian*; and not the Opinion on the Law: Because this Opinion was the *only Sanction* of the Law.

On the whole, had not our Poet adjudged it a Matter of much Importance, he had hardly dwelt so long upon it, or returned again to it^b, or laid so much Stress on it, or made his Hero so attentively consider it.

“ Constitit Anchisa satus, & vestigia pressit,
“ MULTA PUTANS. —

But having added — “ Sortemque animo misera-
“ tus iniquam;” and Servius commented, *Iniqua enim fors est puniri propter aliorum negligentiam: nec enim quis culpa sua caret Sepulchro*; Mr. Bayle cries

^a Ab interdictione apud *Aegyptios* sepulturae poenâ, inolevit apud *Græcos* opinio infultorum corporum animas à Charonte non esse admittas. *Canon Chronicus. Seculum* 11. § 3.

^b V. 373. & seq.

out, *Quelle injustice ! étoit - ce la faute de ces ames que leurs corps n'eussent pas été enterrez*^c. But not knowing the Original of this Opinion, he did not see its Use. And so attributes that to the Blindness of Religion, which was the Issue of wise Policy. *Virgil*, by his *sors iniqua*, means no more than that in this, as well as in several other Civil Institutions, *a general Good was often a private Injury*.

The next observable is the Ferry-man, *Charon*; and he, the Learned well know, was a substantial *Egyptian*; and, as an ingenious Writer says, *fairly existing in this World*. The Case was plainly thus: The *Egyptians*, like all other People, in their Descriptions of the other World, used to resemble it to something they were well acquainted with in this. In their Funeral Rites, which, as we observed, was with them a Matter of greater Moment than with any other Nation, they used to carry their Dead over the *Nile*, and through the Marsh of *Acherusia*; and there put them into subterraneous Vaults: And the Ferry-man was in their Language called *Charon*. Now in their Descriptions of the other World, in the Mysteries, it was natural for them to borrow from these Circumstances in the Funeral Rites. And that they themselves transferred these Realities into the *MYTHOS*, and not the *Greeks*, as their later Writers generally imagine, might be very easily proved if there was occasion.

But *Aeneas* hath now crossed the River, and is come into the proper Regions of the Dead. The first Thing that occurs to him is the Dog *Cerberus*:

“ Hæc ingens latratu regna trifauci
“ Personat, adversq; recubans immanis in Antro.

^c *Repons. aux Quest. d' un Provincial*, p. 3. c. 22.

This is plainly the Phantom in the Mysteries, which *Plerho* tells us above, was in the Shape of a Dog, *κυνῶσιν τινα*. And in the Fable of *Hercules's* descent into Hell, which, we have shewn, signified no more than his Initiation into the Mysteries, it is said to have been for fetching up the Dog *Cerberus*.

The Regions are, according to *Virgil's* Division, in three Parts: 1. Purgatory, 2. Tartarus, 3. Elysium. For *Deiphobus* in the first says,

“ Discedam, *explebo numerum*, reddarque *tenebris*^d.

And in the second it is said of *Theseus*,

“ Sedet, *æternumque sedebit*

“ Infelix *Theseus*. —

The Mysteries divided these Regions in the very same Manner. So *Plato* in the Passage^e quoted above, speaks, as taught there, of Souls sticking fast in Mire and Filth, and remaining in Darkness, till a long Series of Years had *purged and purified* them. And *Celsus*, in *Origen*, we have seen^f, says that *eternal Punishments* were taught in the Mysteries.

And here it is very observable to our Purpose, that the Virtues and Vices which the Poet recapitulates, as stocking these three Divisions with Inhabitants, are those which most immediately affect Society. A plain Proof that he was directed by the same Views with the Institutors of the Mysteries.

Purgatory, the first Division, is inhabited by Suicides, extravagant Lovers, and ambitious Warriors: and in a Word, by all those, who had given

^d But the Nature and End of this Purgatory the Poet describes at large, from v. 736. to v. 745.

^e See Note (g) p. 160.

^f See Note (h) p. 171.

a loose to the Exorbitancy of their Passions; which made them rather miserable, than wicked. It is remarkable that amongst these is one of the *Initiated*:

“ Cererique sacrum Polybœten.

Which was agreeable to the public Teaching in the Mysteries, that *Initiation* without Virtue, was of no avail to the Initiated; though, with it, they had great Advantages over other Mortals in a future State.

But, of all these Disorders, *Suicide* is most pernicious to Society. And, accordingly, the Misery of their Condition is more distinctly marked out to us:

“ Proxima deinde tenent mœsti loca, qui sibi

“ lethum

“ Infantes peperere manu, lucemque perosi

“ Projecere animas. Quam vellent æthere in alto

“ Nunc & pauperiem & duros perferre labores!

Here the Poet keeps close to the Mysteries; which not only forbade *Suicide*, but taught on what account it was criminal. *That which is taught in the MYSTERIES*, says *Plato*, concerning these Matters, of *Man's* being placed in a certain Watch, or Station, which it is unlawful to fly from, or forsake, is a profound Doctrine, and not easily fathomed^s.

Hitherto

Ε' Ο μὲν οὖν ἐν ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΟΙΣ λεγόμενος πρὸς αὐτῶν λόγος, ὡς ἐν τῇ Φερίᾳ ἐσμὲν οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ἡ δὲ ἐαυτὴν ἐκ ταύτης λύνει, καὶ ἀποδιδράσκειν, μέγας ἔστι μοι φαίνεται καὶ ἡ ἰαχὴ διιδέν. *Phæd.* p. 62. *Ser. Ed. Tom. 1.* The very Learned Mr. *Dacier* translates ἐν ἀπορήτοις *dans les Mysteres*; and this, agreeable to his vast Knowledge of Antiquity. For ἀπέρηλα signified, not only the grand Secret taught in the Mysteries, but, was likewise used by the Ancients for the Mysteries in general: as appears from innumerable Places in their Writings. Yet the

French

Hitherto all goes well. But what must we say to the Poet's putting *Children*, and Men *falsely condemned*, into his Purgatory? For though the modern *Roman Faith and Inquisition* sends these two

Sorts

French Translator of Pufendorf's Law of Nature and Nations, l. 2. c. 4. § 19. Note (1) accuses him of not understanding his Author. "Mr. Dacier fait dire à Platon que l'on tenoit tous les jours ces discours au Peuple dans les Cérémonies & dans les Mystères. Il seroit à souhaiter qu'il eût allégué quelque autorité pour établir un fait si remarquable. Mais il s'agit ici manifestement des Instructions secrètes que les Pythagoriciens donnoient à leurs Initiez, et lesquelles ils decouvroient les raisons les plus abstruses, & les plus particuliers des Dogmes de leur Philosophie. Ces instructions cachées s'appelloient *ἑκρέμια*. — Ce que Platon dit un peu auparavant de Philolaüs, Philosophe Pythagoricien, ne permet pas de douter que la raison, qu'il rapporte ici comme trop abstruse et difficile à comprendre ne soit celle que donnoient les Pythagoriciens." He says, *it was to be wished Dacier had some Authority for so remarkable a Fact*. He hath this very Passage: which is Authority enough. The Word *ἑκρέμια* signifies the Mysteries, and cannot in this Place signify the secret Doctrines of the Philosophers; as will be shewn presently. But those who want further Authority, may have it, amply, in the Nature and End of the Mystery, as explained above. — He says, *it is evident, Plato is here talking of the secret Instructions which the Pythagoreans gave to their Initiated, in which they discovered their most abstruse and particular Doctrines*. This cannot possibly be so, for a very evident Reason. The Philosophy of the Pythagoreans, like that of other Sects, was divided into the *Exoteric* and *Esoteric*; the *Open* taught to all, and the *Secret* taught to a select Number. But the *Impiety of Suicide* was a Doctrine in the first Division taught to all, as serviceable to Society. So *Tully*, in his *Dream of Scipio*, writ in the *Exoteric* way, condemns *suicide*, for the very Reason given in the Mysteries. But in an Epistle to a particular Friend, which certainly was of the *Esoteric* kind, he approves of it. — *Ceteri quidem, Pompeius, Lentulus tunc, Scipio Afranius, facie perierunt. At Cato præclarè. Jam illuc quidem, cum volumus, libet.* L. 9. Ep. 18. It could not be therefore, that the *Impiety of Suicide* could be called one of the *ἑκρέμια* of Philosophy; for on the contrary, it was one of their *popular* Doctrines. But this will be fuller seen when we come to speak of the Philosophers in the next Book. — He concludes, that *as Plato had spoke of Philolaüs a little before, it cannot be doubted but that he speaks of the Reason*

Sorts of Persons into a Place of Punishment, yet the Genius of ancient Paganism had a far gentler Spirit. It is indeed difficult to tell what these Infants have to do here. And the Commentators, as is their Use, observe a profound Silence. Let us consider first, the Case of the Infants; which we shall find can be cleared up only in our View of things; which, I desire, may be considered as another strong Presumption of its Truth.

- “ Continuo auditæ voces, vagitus & ingens,
 “ Infantumque animæ flentes in limine primo:
 “ Quos dulcis vitæ exortes, & ubere raptos
 “ Abstulit atra dies, & funere mersit acerbo.

These appear to have been the *Cries and Lamentings* that *Proclus* tells us, were heard in the Mysteries^h. So that we only want to know the Original of so extraordinary an Opinion. Which I take to have been just such another Institution of the Legislator, for the Preservation of the Offspring, as that, about *Funeral Rites*, was for the Parents. Nothing sure could more engage Parents to the Care and Preservation of their Young, than so terrible a Doctrine. Nor are we to think, that their instinctive Fondness needed no inforcement, or support to the Discharge of this natural Duty. For that most degenerate and horrid Practice amongst the An-

son against Suicide, as a Doctrine of the Pythagorean Philosophy. What has been said above, utterly excludes any such Interpretation. But though it did not, his Reason will not infer it. There is nothing in the Context, that shews *Plato* had *Philolaüs* in his Mind here. That this was a Doctrine, though not of the Esoteric Kind, in the Pythagoric School, I readily allow. The Mysteries, and that, held an infinite Number of things in Common: We have seen this in part already, and when we come to speak of *Pythagoras*, we shall shew how this happened.

^h Καὶ τοῖς πρῶτοις τῆς αἰῶνος ὀφρῶντος πρῶτος ἀγῶν ἀνίσταται. In Comment. in Platonis R. p. l. 10.

cients, of exposing Infants, was universal; and, had almost erased Morality and Instinct. So that it needed the strongest and severest Check: And I am well persuaded it was that, which occasioned this Counterplot of the Magistrate; in order to give Instinct fair play, and call back banished Nature. Nothing indeed could be more worthy of his Care: For the Destruction of Children, as *Pericles* finely observed of Youth, is *like cutting off the Spring from the Year*.

Here Mr. *Bayle* is again scandalized: “ La premiere chose que l’on rencontroit à l’entrée des Enfers, étoit la station des petits enfans, qui ne cessoient de pleurer, & puis celle des personnes injustement condamnées à la mort. Quoi de plus choquant, de plus scandaleux, que la peine de ces petites creatures qui n’avoient encore commis nul péché; ou que la peine de ceux dont l’innocence avoit été opprimée par la calomnie?” The first Case we have cleared up; the second we shall consider presently. But it is no Wonder Mr. *Bayle* could not digest this Doctrine of the Infants; for, I am very much mistaken, if it did not stick with the great *Plato* himself. Who relating the *Vision* of *Erus the Pamphylian*, concerning the Distribution of Rewards and Punishments in a future State, when he comes to the Condition of Infants, passes it over in this remarkable Manner: — *But of Children who died in their Infancy, he reported certain other things NOT WORTHY TO BE RECORDED*^k. *Erus’s* account of what he saw in another World, is a Summary of what the *Egyptians* taught of that Matter. And I make no Question, but the Thing

ⁱ *Reponse aux Quest. d’un Prov. p. 3. c. 22.*

^k Τῶν δὲ ὄντων χαμῶται, καὶ ὀλίγοι χαλεπὸν βιάστανται πρὸς ἄλλα ἔλε-
 γον ΟΥΚ ΑΞΙΑ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ. *De Rep. l. 10. p. 615. Ser.*
Ed.

here

here *unworthy of being recorded*, was the Doctrine of *Infants in Purgatory*: which *Plato*, not reflecting on the Original and Use, as here delivered, was shocked at.

But now, as to the *falsely condemned*, we must seek another Solution of that Matter, the most perplexing Difficulty in the whole *Æneis*:

- “ Hos juxta, falso damnati crimine mortis ;
- “ Nec vero hæc sine sorte datæ, sine judice sedes.
- “ Quæsitur Minos urnam movet : ille silentum
- “ Conciliumque vocat, vitasque & crimina discit.

Here appears a strange Jumble as well as Iniquity in this Designment: the falsely accused are not only in a Place of Punishment, but, being first represented under one Predicament, they are afterwards distinguished, some as blameable, others as innocent. To clear up all this Confusion, we must transcribe an old Story told by *Plato* in his *Gorgias*: “ There was this Law concerning Mortals in the time of *Saturn*, and is now always enforced by the Gods; that he who hath lived a just and pious Life, should at his Death be carried into the Islands of the Bleß'd, and there possess all kinds of Happiness, untainted with the Evils of Mortality: but that he who had lived unjustly and impiously, should be thrust into a Place of Punishment, the Prison of divine Justice, called *Tartarus*. Now the Judges, with whom the Execution of this Law was intrusted, were, in the Time of *Saturn*, and under the fancy of *Jove's* Government, *living Men, sitting in Judgment on the Living*; and decreeing, and appointing the very Day, on which every one should die. This gave occasion to iniquitous and perverse Judgments: On which account *Pluto*, and those, to whom the Care of the happy Islands was

“ committed, went to *Jupiter*, and told him, that
 “ Men came to them *wrongly judged, both when ac-*
 “ *quitted and when condemned.* To which the Father
 “ of the Gods made this reply : I will put a stop to
 “ this Evil, says he. These wrong Judgments are
 “ partly occasioned by the corporeal Covering of
 “ the Persons judged ; for they are tried while liv-
 “ ing : Now many have their corrupted Minds hid
 “ under a fair Outside, adorned with Birth and
 “ Riches ; and when they come to their Trial,
 “ they have many Witnesses at hand to testify for
 “ their good Life and Conversation : This per-
 “ verts the Process, and blinds the Eyes of Justice.
 “ Another Cause of this Evil is, that the Judges
 “ themselves are likewise incumbered with the same
 “ corporeal Covering : The Mind is hid and in-
 “ veloped in Eyes and Ears¹, and an impenetrable
 “ Tegument of Flesh. All these are Bars and Ob-
 “ stacles to right Judgment, as well their own
 “ Covering, as the Covering of those they judge.
 “ In the first place then, says he, we are to pro-
 “ vide that they no longer have a Fore-knowledge
 “ of the Day of Death, which they now foresee :
 “ We shall therefore give this in charge to *Prome-*
 “ *theus*, to take away their Prescience ; and then
 “ provide that they who come to Judgment, be
 “ stripp’d naked of all their Disguises : for they
 “ are from henceforth to receive it in another
 “ World. And as they are to be quite stripped, it
 “ is but fit the Judges should be so too : that, at

¹ The Original to ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ ὠτίαι, adds ὀδόντων, *teeth*. If
 this be the true Reading, I presume *Plato* intended by it, to ri-
 dicule the *Athenian* Judges ; who, like more modern ones, out
 of Impatience for their Dinner, would sometimes acquit or con-
 demn before they were possessed of the Merits of the Cause : But
 as this seems too ludicrous a Circumstance for the Subject, I su-
 spect it rather to be an unmeaning Blunder of some old Tran-
 scriber.

“ the arrival of every new Inhabitant, who comes
 “ forsaken of all about him, and every worldly
 “ Ornament left behind, Soul may look on Soul,
 “ and be thereby enabled to pass a righteous Judge-
 “ ment. I therefore, who foresaw all these Things,
 “ before you felt them, have taken care to consti-
 “ tute my own Sons Judges: two of them, *Minos*
 “ and *Rhadamanthus*, are *Asiatics*; the third, *Æa-*
 “ *cus*, an *European*: These, when they die, shall
 “ have their Tribunal erected in the Shades, just
 “ in that Part of the High-way, where the two
 “ Roads divide, the one leading to the happy
 “ Islands, the other to *Tartarus*: *Rhadamanthus*
 “ shall judge the *Asiatics*, and *Æacus* the *Europe-*
 “ *ans*. But to *Minos* I give the superior Authority of
 “ bearing Appeals, when any thing obscure or diffi-
 “ cult shall perplex the other’s Judgments; that
 “ every one may have his due Abode assigned him
 “ with the utmost Equity^m.”

The

^m Ἦν δὲ νόμος ὅδε πρὸς ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ Κόρη, καὶ αἰεὶ ἐκὼν ἐπὶ τῶν
 ἐν θεοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν δίκαιων τῶν βίων διεληλυθὼς ὅστις, ἐπειδὴ
 τελευτήσῃ, εἰς μακάρων νῆας ἀπέρχεται, οὐκ ἐν πάσῃ ἀδίκῃ, οὐκ
 ἐν πᾶσι κακῶν τῶν ἡδονῶν καὶ ἀλγῶν, εἰς τὴν τίσιν τε καὶ δίκῃ δια-
 μνησκει, ὃ δὲ τάδε αὖτε καλεῖται, ἵνα. τῶν δὲ δικαστῶν ἐπὶ Κόρη,
 καὶ ἐπὶ νεώτῃ Διὸς τῶν δὲ δὲ ἔχοντες, ζῶντες ἦσαν ζῶντων, αὐτῶν
 ἡμέρας δικάζοντες ἢ μέλλουσιν τελευτᾶν κακῶς ἐν αἰδῶνι ἐκείνῃ.
 ὅτε δὲ Πλάτων καὶ οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ ἐν μακάρων νῆσων ἵκοντες, ἔλεον
 πρὸς τὴν Διὰ ὅτι φοιτᾶν σφιν ἄνθρωποι ἐκατέρωσε ἀνάξιοι. εἶπεν δὲ ὁ
 Ζεὺς, Ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ (ἔφη) παύσω τὸ το γινώμενον. καὶ μὴ γὰρ κακῶς αἱ
 δίκαι δικάζονται· ἀμπεχόμενοι γὰρ (ἔφη) οἱ κεραιόμενοι καὶ κέρουσι· ζῶντες
 γὰρ κέρουσι. πολλοὶ δὲ ψυχὰς ποικίλως ἔχουσιν, κεραιόμενοι καὶ σά-
 ματά τε καλὰ, καὶ ἡβή καὶ πλεῖστα· καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἡ κέρουσι τῶν
 αὐτοῖς πολλοὶ μαρτυρεῖται, μαρτυρεῖσά τε, ὡς δίκαιος ἐκείνους. οἱ δὲ
 δικαστῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκπλήτων, καὶ ἅμα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀμπεχόμενοι δι-
 κάζουσι, πρὸς τὴν ψυχῆς τῶν αὐτῶν ἐξελκυσσόμενοι καὶ ὅτι καὶ σῶμα
 περικαλυμμένη. ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῖς πάντα ἐπιπράδεν γνῆναι, καὶ τα
 αὐτῶν ἀμφιέσθαι, καὶ τὰ κεραιόμενοι. πρῶτος δὲ ἐν (ἔφη) παύσεται
 ἐπὶ πρῶτος αὐτὸς τὸ θάνατον. καὶ γὰρ πρῶτος αὐτὸς μὲν καὶ οὐ
 εἴρη) γὰρ Περρῶν, ὅπως ἀν παύσεται αὐτὸς αὐτῶν. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ κέρουσι
 αὐτῶν ἀμπεχόμενοι. τινεώτας γὰρ δεῖ κέρουσι, καὶ τὴν κέρουσι γὰρ

they are wrong stationed, through an Oversight of the Poet: for we see, by the Fable, they should have been placed on the Borders of the three Divisions, in that Part of the high Road, that divides itself in two, which lead to *Tartarus* and *Elysium*; thus, afterwards, described by the Poet:

“ Hic locus est, partes ubi se via findit in ambas.

“ Dexterâ, quæ Ditis magni sub mœnia tendit:

“ Hic iter Elysium nobis; at læva malorum

“ Exercet pœnas, & ad impia Tartara mittit.

It only now remains to consider the Ground and Original of the Fable; which, I think was this: It was an *Egyptian* Custom, as we are told by *Diodorus Siculus*, for Judges to be appointed at every one's Interment; to examine their past Lives: and to condemn and acquit, according to the Evidence. These Judges were of the Priesthood; and so, it is probable, taught, like the Priests of the Church of *Rome*, that their Decrees were ratified in the infernal Shades: Partiality and Corruption would, in time, pervert their Sentence; and Spite and Favour prevail over Justice: As this might scandalize the People, it would be found necessary to teach that the Judgment, which influenced every one's final Doom, was reserved for the Judicature of the other World. *This* I take to be what gave birth to the general Fable: But there is one Circumstance, *this* does not so clearly account for; namely, of *the Judges passing Sentence in Life, and predicting the Day of the Criminal's Death*; and the *Order to Prometheus, on the Abolition of their Judicature, to take away this Gift of Prescience*. To understand these Things, we must suppose, what is very probable, that the Custom, mentioned above by *Diodorus*, was only the Succession of a more early one; where the Priests judged the living Criminal

for those Crimes that the Civil Tribunal could not so conveniently take notice of; which is the only justifiable Use of an Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction. If this be so, then, by *predicting the Day of the Criminal's Death* was meant the *Infliction of a capital Punishment*: and, by *Prometheus's taking the Gift from them*, the *Civil Magistrate's Abolition of the Jurisdiction*: And this Name was not ill assigned to him, who forms the Minds and Manners of the People by the plastic Arts of Society. This, in my Opinion, was the Original of *Plato's Fable*: And he seems plainly to have had that Original in mind, when he makes *Socrates* introduce it thus: *Hear then, as they say, a celebrated Tale; which you, I imagine, will call a Fable, but I a true Story*°.

I hope this perplexed Matter is now cleared up to the Reader's Satisfaction. How much it wanted Explanation, may be seen by what one of the greatest Geniuses of his Time hath said of it in a Discourse wrote to illustrate *Aeneas's Descent into Hell*: *There are three Kinds of Persons*, says this celebrated Author, *described, as being situated on the BORDERS; and I can give no Reason for their being stationed there in so particular a manner, but because none of them seem to have had a proper Right to a Place among the Dead, as not having run out the Thread of their Days, and finished the Term of Life that had been allotted them upon Earth*: The first of these are the Souls of Infants, who are snatched away by untimely Ends: The second are of those who are put to Death wrongfully, and by an unjust Sentence: and the third of those who grew weary of their Lives, and laid violent hands upon themselves°.

° ΣΩΚΡ. Ἄκουε οὖν (ταύτην) μάλα καλὴν λόγον· ἐν τῷ β' ἡρώδου βιβλίῳ, ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἀπομνημονεύσει, ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος.

° *Virg. Aeneid. lib. 6. v. 630.* Quinto Ed. 1721.

After this, follow the two Epifodes of *Dido* and *Deiphobus*, in imitation of *Homer*; where we find nothing to our purpose, but the strange Description of the latter, whose mangled Phantom is drawn according to the Philosophy of *Plato*; who teaches in his *Gorgias*, that the Dead not only retain all the Passions of the Soul, but all the Marks and Blemishes of the Body^a.

Æneas having passed this first Division, comes now on the Confines of *Tartarus*; and is instructed in what relates to the Crimes and Punishments of the Inhabitants, by his Guide; who declares her Office of *Hierophante*, or Interpreter of the Mysteries, in these Words:

“ Dux inclyte Teucrum,

“ Nulli fas casto sceleratum insistere limen :

“ Sed me, cum lucis Hecate præfecit æternis,

“ Ipsa Deum pænas docuit, perque omnia duxit.

It is remarkable, that *Æneas* is led through the Regions of Purgatory and *Elysium*; but he only sees the Sights of *Tartarus* at a distance, which his Guide explains to him:

“ Tum demum horrifono stridentes cardine sacræ

“ Panduntur portæ : Cernis, custodia qualis

“ Vestibulo fedeat : facies quæ limina servet?

For thus it must needs be, in the Shews of the Mysteries, for very obvious Reasons.

The Criminals destined to eternal Punishment, in this Division, are,

ἡ Μαστίγιας αὐ εἴτις ἦν, καὶ ἔχρη εἶχε τῶν πλεονῶν ἐλὰς ἐν τῇ ἐ-
μασί, ἢ ὑπὸ μαστίγων ἢ ἀλλων τραυματίων ζῶν, καὶ τελευτῶν το σῶμα
ἐστὶν ἰδεῖν ταῦτα, ἔχον· κατεαγῶτα εἰς τὴν μέσην, ἢ ἀποσπασμένους ζῶν-
τες, καὶ τελευτῶν ταῦτα ἐνδελαι, ἐν ᾧ λόγῳ οἱ, καὶ παρισκάνει το
σῶμα ζῶν, ἐνδελαι ταυτα καὶ τελευτῶνται καὶ ἡ πᾶσι, ἢ καὶ πᾶσι
πᾶσι τινε χρόνον pag. 524.

1. Those who had *sinned so secretly as to escape the Animadversion of the Magistrate*:

“ Gnoſſius hæc Rhadamanthus habet duriffima
“ regna :

“ Caſtigatque auditque dolos, ſubigitque fateri

“ Quæ quis apud ſuperos furto lætatus inani,

“ Diſtulit in ſeram commiſſa piacula mortem.

And it was principally on account of ſuch Crimes, that the Legiſlator inforced the Doctrin of a future State of Punishment.

2. The *Atheiſtical Deſpiſers of God and of Religion*:

“ Hic genus antiquum terræ Titania pubes.

This was agreeable to the Laws of *Charondas*, who ſays, *Be the Contempt of the Gods put in the number of the moſt flagitious Crimes*†. The Poet dwells particularly on that Species of Impiety, that affects divine Honours:

“ Vidi & crudeles dantem Salmonea pœnas,

“ Dum flammas Jovis & ſonitus imitatur Olympi.

And this was doubtleſs deſigned by him for an oblique Caſtigation of the Adulation of the *Apotheoſis*, then beginning to be paid and received at *Rome*. I cannot but think *Horace* likewise, in his Ode, of which *Virgil* is the ſubject, upbraids his Countrymen for this Madneſs:

“ Cœlum ipſum petimus ſtultitia ; neque

“ Per noſtrum patimur ſcelus

“ Iracunda Jovem ponere fulmina.†

3. The *Infringers of the Duties of Imperfect Obligation, which Civil Laws cannot reach*: ſuch as Want

† Εὖ δὲ μὲνιστα ἀνὴρ ἀνὰ θεῶν καλὰ φρονεῖν, ap. Stob. Serm. 42.

† Carm. Lib. 1, Od. 3,

of natural Affection to Brothers, Duty to Parents, Protection to Clients, and Charity to the Poor :

- “ Hic quibus invisi fratres, dum vita manebat ;
- “ Pulsatusve parens ; & fraus innexa clienti¹ ;
- “ Aut qui divitiis foli incubuere reptis,
- “ Nec partem posuere suis ; quæ maxima turba est.

4. Those Pests of public and private Peace, the *Traitor* and the *Adulterer* :

- “ Quique ob adulterium cæsi, quique arma secuti
- “ Impia, nec veriti dominorum fallere dextras —
- “ Vendidit hic auro patriam, dominumque po-
“ tentem
- “ Imposuit : fixit leges pretio atque refixit.
- “ Hic thalamum invasit natæ, vetitosque hyme-
“ næos.

It is observable, he does not say, simply, *Adulteri*, but *ob adulterium cæsi* ; as implying, that the greatest Civil Punishment makes no Atonement for this Crime at the Bar of Divine Justice.

5. The fifth and last Species of Offenders are the *Invaders and Violators of the holy Mysteries*, held out in the Person of *Theseus* :

- “ Sedet, æternumque sedebit
- “ Infelix Theseus ; Phlegyasque miserrimus omnes
- “ Admonet, & magna testatur voce per umbras :
- “ DISCITE JUSTITIAM MONITI, ET NON TEM-
“ NERE DIVOS.

The Fable says, that *Theseus*, and his Friend *Pirithous*, formed a Design to steal *Proserpine* from Hell ; but being taken in the Fact, *Pirithous* was thrown to the Dog *Cerberus*, and *Theseus* kept in

¹ So the Law of the Twelve Tables: PATRONUS SI CLIENTI FRAUDEM FECERIT, SACER ESTO.

Chains, 'till delivered by *Hercules*. Hereby, no doubt, was designed their clandestine Intrusion into the Mysteries; for which they were punished, as the Fable relates. This brings to my mind a Story told by *Livy*. The Athenians (says he) drew upon themselves a War with Philip, on a very slight Occasion; at a time, when nothing remained of their ancient Fortune, but their high Spirit. Two young Acarnanians, during the Days of Initiation, themselves uninitiated and ignorant of all that related to that secret Worship, entred the Temple of Ceres along with the Croud. Their Discourse soon betrayed them; as making some absurd Enquiries into what they saw: so being brought before the President of the Mysteries, although it was evident they had entred ignorantly, and without Design, they were put to death, as guilty of a most abominable Impiety^u.

The *Phlegyas* here mentioned, I take to be those People of *Boetia* spoke of by *Pausanias*, who attempting to plunder the Temple of *Apollo* at *Delphi*, were almost all destroyed by Lightning, Earthquakes, and Pestilence: Hence *Phlegyas*, I suppose, signified impious, sacrilegious Persons in general; and is so to be understood here.

The Office *Theseus* is put upon, of admonishing his Hearers against Impiety, could not sure be discharged by any one so well, in the Shews of the Mysteries, as by him who represented the Violator of them. And here it is to be observed, that our View of Things frees this Passage from an Absur-

^u Contraxerant autem cum Philippo bellum Athenienses haud quaquam dignâ causâ, cum ex vetere fortunâ nihil præter animos servant. Acarnanes duo juvenes per initiationum dies, non initiati, templum Ceresis, imprudentes Religionis, cum ceterâ turbâ ingressi sunt. Facile eos sermo prodidit, absurde quædam percunctantes; deductique ad antilites templi, cum palam esset, per errorem ingrossor, tamquam ob infandam scelus, interfecti sunt. *Hist. lib. 31.*

dity,

dity, which the Critics could never get over. They say there could not be a more impertinent Employment, than perpetually founding in the Ears of the Damned this Admonition :

DISCITE JUSTITIAM MONITI, ET NON TEM-
NERE DIVOS.

For though it be a Sentence of great Truth and Dignity, it was very uselessly preached amongst those, to whom there was no room for Pardon or Remission.

Even the ridiculous *Scarron*, who has employed all his poor Talents in abusing the most useful Poem that ever was written, hath not neglected to urge this Objection against it :

“ Cette sentence est bonne & belle,

“ Mais en Enfer de quoi fert-elle ?

And it must be confessed that, according to the common Ideas of *Aeneas's* Descent into Hell, *Virgil* hath put *Theseus* on a very impertinent Office.

But nothing could be juster, or more useful than this continual Admonition, if we suppose *Virgil* to be here giving (as indeed he was) a Representation of what was said during the Celebration of the Shews of the Mysteries : For then it was addressed to the vast Multitude of living Spectators. But it is not a bare Supposition of Likelyhood, that this admonitory Circumstance made Part of the Representations. *Aristides* expressly tells us^w, that no where was MORE ASTONISHING WORDS SUNG than in these Mysteries ; and the Reason he gives us for such Practice is, that the Sounds and Sights might mutually assist each other in making an

^w Ταῖς δ' ἀλλὰ φασὶν, ἡ μέντοι ὅλην συνουσίαν ἐκπύουσαν, ἢ τὰ δαίμνια μέγ' ἔχει τὴν εκπύξιν, ἢ πάντες αἱ ἐραυμένα κατεστη-
ται; ἀκοῇ, τὰ ὁράματα. *Eusebius.*

Impression on the Minds of the Initiated. But, from a Passage in *Pindar* I conclude, that in the Shews of the Mysteries (from whence Men's Ideas of the infernal Regions were all taken) it was customary for each Offender, represented under Punishment, to make his Admonition against his own Crime, as he passed by in Machinery. *It is reported* (says *Pindar*) *that Ixion, while he is incessantly turning round his rapid Wheel, calls out to this effect to MORTALS, That they should be always at hand to repay a Benefactor for the Kindnesses he hath done them* *. Where the Word *BPOTOI*, *living Men*, seems plainly to shew the Speech to have been made before Men in this World.

The Poet closes his Catalogue of the Damned with these Words :

“ *Ausi omnes immane nefas, AUSOQUE POTITI.*

For there was a general Notion among the Ancients, that Success sanctified the Action ; as it was an Indication of the Approbation and Assistance of the Gods. As this was a very pernicious Opinion, it was necessary to obviate it, by shewing, that the Imperial Villain who enslaved his Country, and the baffled Plotter who died on a Gibbet, were equally the Objects of divine Justice.

Æneas now passed *Tartarus*, comes to the Borders of *Elysium*. Here he undergoes the Lustration :

“ *Occupat Æneas aditum, corpusque recenti*

“ *Spargit aquâ, ramumque adverso in limine figit.*

And then enters into the Abodes of the Blessed :

* Ἰξίων φαντὶ ταῦτα
Βροτοῖς λεγέει, ἐν πλοῦσι τρυχῶ
Πατὶ κελυδομένων,
Τὸν δὲ γέγεται ἀγααῖς ἀμοιβαῖς
Ἐπιχρῆδρος τιναῖ. 2. *Pyth.*

“ *Deve-*

- “ Devenere locos lætos, & amœna vireta
 “ Fortunatorum nemorum, fedesque beatas :
 “ Largior hic campos æther, & lumine vestit
 “ Purpureo : solemque suum, sua sidera norunt.

In the very same manner *Themistius* describes the Initiated just entred upon this Scene. — Being thoroughly purified, he now discloses to the Initiated a Region all over illuminated, and shining with a divine Splendour. The Cloud and thick Darkness are dispersed; and the Mind emerges, as it were, into Day, full of Light and Chearfulness, as before, of disconsolate Obscurity^y. And this Succession, from *Tartarus* to *Elysium*, makes *Aristides* call these Rites MOST HORRIBLE, AND MOST RAVISHINGLY PLEASANT^z.

Here *Virgil*, by forsaking *Homer*, and following the Representations of the Mysteries, in their amiable Paintings of *Elysium*, hath avoided a terrible Fault his Master fell into; who hath given so unamiable and joyless a Picture of the *fortunata nemora*, that they can raise no Desire or Appetite for them; defeating thereby the Intent of the Legislator in propagating the Belief of them. He makes even his Favourite Hero himself, who enjoyed them, tell *Ulysses* that he had rather be a Day-labourer above, than command the Regions of the Dead: and all his Heroes in general are described as in an unhappy State: Nay, to mortify every Excitement to great and virtuous Actions,

^y — ἀπομήξας παλαχέθιν, ἰσπεδείκνυ τῷ μυημένῳ μακροέσ-
 σον τε ἤδη, καὶ αὐγὴν κατὰ λαμπρότητα θεασσεται, ἥ τε ἐμ. χλὴ σκένει, ἔ-
 τὸ νέφθ' ἀθρόον, ὑπερέκνυθ' καὶ ἐξεραιεῖ· νῆς ἐν δ' ἑβάς, φεύγας
 ἀνάπλεως καὶ ἀγλάας ἀντι δ' ὑπὲρ τέρων σκότε. *Orat. in Patrem.*

^z Κοινόν τι τῆς γῆς τέλειθ' ἐκ τῆς Ἑλυσίου ἡγῆτο. καὶ πάντες ὅσα
 θεὸν ἀνθρώποις, τῶν τιν' ΦΡΙΚΩΔΕΣΤΑΤΟΝ τε καὶ ΦΑΙΔΡΟ-
 ΤΑΤΟΝ. *Eleusiniā.*

he makes Reputation, Fame, and Glory, the great Spurs to Well-doing in the Pagan World, and which in no World should be entirely taken off, to be impertinent and senseless. On the contrary, *Virgil*, whose sole Aim, in this Poem, was the Good of Society, makes Fame and Love of Glory so strong Passions in the other World, that the Sibyl's Promise to *Palinurus*, only that his Name should be perpetuated, rejoices his Shade even in the Regions of the Unhappy :

— “ *Æternumque locus Palinuri nomen habebit :*

“ *His dictis curæ emotæ, pulsusque parumper*

“ *Corde dolor tristi : gaudet cognomine terra.*

It was this ungracious Description of the other World, and the licentious Stories of the Gods, both so pernicious to Society, that made *Plato* banish *Homer* out of his Republic.

I. The first Place, in the happy Regions, the Poet gives to the *Legislators*, and those who brought Mankind from a State of Nature into Society :

“ *Magnanimi Heroës, nati melioribus annis.*

At the Head of these is *Orpheus*, the most renowned of the *European* Legislators ; but better known under the Character of Poet : For the first Laws being wrote in measure, to allure Men to learn them, and when learnt, to retain them ; the Fable would have it, that *Orpheus* softened the Savages of *Thrace* by the Force of Harmony :

—— “ *Threïcius longâ cum veste sacerdos*

“ *Obloquitur numeris septem discrimina vocum.*

But he has the first Place, because he was not only a Legislator, but the Introducer of the Mysteries in that Part of *Europe*.

2. The next Place is allotted to *Patriots, and those who died for the Service of their Country*:

“ Hic manus, ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi.

3. The third to *Virtuous and pious Priests*:

“ Quique sacerdotes casti, dum vita manebat ;

“ Quique pii vates & Phœbo digna locuti.

For it was of principal Use to Society, that religious Men should lead holy Lives, and teach nothing of the Gods but what was agreeable to the Divine Nature.

4. The last Place is given to the *Inventors of Arts mechanical and liberal*:

“ Inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artes :

“ Quique sui memores alios fecere merendo.

Virgil has here all along closely followed the Teachers in the Mysteries, who incessantly inculcated that Virtue only could entitle Men to Happiness; and that Rites, Ceremonies, Lustrations, and Sacrifices could not supply the Want of it.

Vast Numbers pass in Review before *Æneas*, both on this and the other side *Styx*:

“ Matres atque Viri, defunctaque corpora vitâ

“ Magnanimûm heroum, pueri innuptæque puellæ.

“ Hunc circum innumeræ gentes populique vola-

“ bant.

And *Aristides* tells us, that in the Shews of the Mysteries *innumerable Generations of Men and Women* appeared to the Initiated.

But now, notwithstanding the entire Conformity between all these Scenes and those represented in

^a “ὅσα μὲν δὴ θείας ἰσχύος εἶδον γενεαὶ παντληβείς ἀδελφεῖς γυναι-
κῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις φασμασι. *Eleusinia*.

the Mysteries, something is still wanting to give the last Conviction to the Truth of our Interpretation ; and that is, the famous SECRET of the Mysteries, of which so much hath been said in the last Section ; where we have endeavoured to bring it to Light, and shew it to have been the Doctrine of the *Unity of the Godhead*. Had *Virgil* neglected to give us this principal Circumstance, though we must needs have said his Intention was to represent an Initiation, we had been forced to own he had done it imperfectly. But he was too good a Painter, to leave any thing ambiguous in his Drawings ; and hath therefore concluded his Hero's Initiation, as was the Custom, with instructing him in the ANOPPHTA, or the Doctrine of the *Unity*. 'Till this was done, the Initiated was not arrived to the highest Stage of Perfection : nor was in the fullest Sense intitled to the Appellation of ΕΠΟΠΤΗΣ.

Museus, therefore, who had been Hierophante at *Albens*, is made to conduct him to the Place, where his Father's Shade opens to him this hidden Doctrine of Perfection, in these sublime Words :

- “ Principio cœlum, ac terras, camposque liquentes,
- “ Lucentemque globum Lunæ, Titaniaque astra
- “ SPIRITUS INTUS ALIT, totamque infusa per
- “ artus
- “ MENS agitat molem, & magno se corpore miscet.
- “ Inde hominum pecudumque genus, vitæque vo-
- “ lantum,
- “ Et quæ marmoreo fert monstra sub æquore
- “ pontus.

Anchises proceeds to explain the Nature and Use of Purgatory, which in his Hero's Passage through that Region, had not been done. And then comes to the Doctrine of the *Metempsychosis*, or Transmigration. A Notion, as we have shewn, sedulously

eburneâ portâ emittit, indicat profecto, quidquid à se de illo inferorum aditu dictum est, in fabulis esse numerandum. This Conclusion is strengthened by the Circumstance of *Virgil's* being an Epicurean; and speaking to the same Purpose, in his second *Georgic*:

- “ Felix, qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas,
 “ Atque metus omnes & inexorabile fatum
 “ Subjecit pedibus, *strepitumque Acherontis avari!*

But what a wretched Conclusion do these Men make the Divine *Virgil* put to this Master-piece of all his Works! For he wrote it, not to amuse old Women and Children, in a Winter's Evening, in the Taste of the *Milesian Fables*; but for Men and Citizens; to instruct them in the Devoirs of Humanity and Society. Consequently his Ends in this Book must have been, *First*, to make the *Doctrine of a future State* useful in Civil Life; which, it is evident, he has done in the Distribution of the Rewards and Punishments of it. *Secondly*, to set his Hero on an Adventure worthy his Character. Now, if we will believe our Critics, when he has strained all his Nerves, throughout a whole Book, to compass these Ends, and got at length to the Conclusion, he wantonly defeats them with one senseless Dash of his Pen; that speaks to this effect: “ I have
 “ laboured, Countrymen, to draw you to Virtue,
 “ and to deter you from Vice, in order to make every particular, and Society in general, flourishing
 “ and happy. And doing this by Example, I have
 “ inculcated the Truths I would teach you, in the
 “ Adventures of your great Ancestor and Founder;
 “ whom, to do you the greater Honour, I have
 “ made an accomplished Hero; and have put upon
 “ the most divine and hazardous Undertaking, the
 “ instituting a Civil Policy; and, to sanctify his

“ Character, and add Sanction to his Laws, have
 “ sent him on the Errand you see here related :
 “ But lest the Adventure should do you any Ser-
 “ vice, or my Hero any Honour ; I must inform
 “ you, that all this Talk of a future State is an
 “ idle, childish Notion, and our Hero’s part there-
 “ in only a *Lenten* Dream. In a Word, all that
 “ you, have heard must pass for an unmeaning Re-
 “ verie: from which you are to draw no Conse-
 “ quences but that the Poet was in a capricious
 “ Humour, and disposed to laugh at your Super-
 “ stitions.” — At this Rate, I say, is *Virgil* made
 to speak, in the Interpretation of ancient and mo-
 dern Critics,

The Truth is, this monstrous difficulty can never
 possibly be got over, but upon our Scheme ; which
 teaches, that *Virgil*, in this Story of the Descent,
 meant only *an Initiation into the Mysteries*. This
 unriddles the *Ænigma*, and restores the Poet to
 himself. For if this was *Virgil’s* Intention, it is to
 be presumed, he would give some private Mark to
 ascertain his secret Meaning : for which no place
 sure was so proper as the Conclusion. He has,
 therefore, with a Beauty of Invention peculiar to
 him, made this fine Improvement on *Homer’s* Story
 of the two Gates ; who imagined that of Horn for
 true Visions, and that of Ivory for false. By the
 first he insinuates the *Reality* of another State ; and
 by the second, the shadowy Representations of it
 in the Shews of the Mysteries : So that the Visions
 of *Æneas* were false, not as there was no Ground
 or Foundation for a future State ; but, as those he
 saw, were not indeed in Hell, but in the Temple
 of *Ceres*. The Representation being called ΜΥΘΟΣ
 κατ’ ἐξοχήν. And this we give as the true Mean-
 ing of,

“ *Altera*

“ *Altera candenti perfecta nitens elephanto:*

“ *Sed falsa ad Cælum mittunt insomnia Manes.*

But though the Dream that issued from it was *unsubstantial*, I make no question, but the Ivory Gate itself was *Real*. It appears indeed, to be neither more nor less than the sumptuous Gate of the Temple, through which the Initiated came out when the Celebration was over. This was of an immense bigness, as appears from the Words of *Apuleius*: *Senex comississimus duxit me protinus ad ipsas foras ÆDIS AMPLISSIMÆ^c*. But *Vitruvius's* Description of it is very curious: “ *ELEUSINÆ Cereris & Proserpinæ cellam IMMANI MAGNITUDE* “ *Itinus Dorico more, sine exterioribus columnis* “ *ad laxamentum usus Sacrificiorum, pertexit. Eam* “ *autem postea, cum Demetrius Phalereus Athe-* “ *nis rerum potiretur, Philon ante Templum in* “ *fronte columnis constitutis Prostylon fecit. Ita* “ *aucto Vestibulo laxamentum iniiantibus operisque sum-* “ *mam adjecit auctoritatem^d.*

Here was room, we see, and so purposely continued, for all these Shews and Representations. And now, as we have said so much of them, yet occasionally, and by parts, it will not be amiss before we conclude to give a general and concise Idea of them. I take the Substance of the Celebration to be a kind of Drama, of the History of *Ceres*, which afforded Opportunity to represent these three Things, about which the Mysteries were principally concerned. 1. *The Rise and Establishment of Civil Society.* 2. *The Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments.* 3. *The Detection of the Error of Polytheism, and the Principle of the Unity.* The Goddess's Legislation in *Shidy* and

^c *Metam.* l. 11.

^d *De Architect. Præf.* ad l. 7.

Attica, at both which Places she was said to civilize the Savage Manners of the Inhabitants, gave Birth to the *first*^e: Her Search for her Daughter *Proserpine* in Hell, to the *second*: And her Resentment against the Gods for the Theft, to the *third*^e.

I have now gone through my Explanation of this famous Voyage. And, if I be not greatly deceived, the View, in which I have placed it, not only clears up and explains a number of Difficulties inexplicable on any other Scheme; but likewise gives an uncommon Grace and Elegance of Perfection to the whole Poem: For now this famous Episode appears to be entirely of a piece with the main Subject; which was the Erection of a Civil Policy and a Religion: For Custom had made Initiation into the Mysteries an indispensable Preparative to that arduous Undertaking.

Thus far then concerning the Legislator's Care to perpetuate the Doctrine of a *future State*: And if we have been longer than ordinary on this Head, our Excuse is, that *this Doctrine* is the main Subject of our general Enquiry. That the Magistrate cultivated

* That the Establishment of Society, or the Image of savage and polished Manners was represented in the Mysteries; I collect from several Circumstances. *Diodorus* tells us, that in the *Sicilian Feasts of Ceres*, which lasted ten Days, was represented the ancient Manner of living, before Men had learned the Use and Culture of Bread Corn. Τῆς δὲ Δήμητρος τὴν κατὰ τὴν θνησίαν προέειπεν, ἐν ᾗ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁ πόλις εἶσι λαμβάνει. Ἐπὶ δὲ ἡμέραις ἰστανίονεν ἄβυσσον ἐπὶ νύκτον τὴν δὲ ταύτης, τῇ τε λαμπρότητι τὴν δὲ ἀσπιδόσῃς μεγαλοπρεπείᾳ, καὶ τῇ ΔΙΑΣΚΕΥΗ ΜΙΜΟΥΜΕΝΟΙ ΤΟΝ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΝ ΒΙΟΝ. P. 200. *Steph. Ed.* And we are told, as has been shewn above, that there was a kind of Institute of Civil Laws, wrote upon two Stone Tables promulged in the Mysteries.

† This Circumstance *Apolidorus* informs us of; his Words are these: — Μαθήσα δὲ παρ' ἑρμῆαν, ὅτι πλάτων αὐτὴν ἔπαυεν, ΟΡΓΙΖΟΜΕΝΗ ΘΕΟΙΣ, ΑΠΕΛΙΠΕΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΝ· εἰκοσθεῖσα δὲ γυναῖκί, ἦκεν εἰς Ἑλίουσιν. *Bibl. l. i. c. 5.*

the

the Belief of it, with a more than common Labour, is evident from this very extraordinary Circumstance. — There are several Savage Nations, discovered by modern Travellers, which, it is probable, in the Revolutions and Distractions of Society, being forced to remove their Seats, have fallen from a civilized, to a barbarous Life. These are found to be without any Knowledge of a God, or Appearance of Religion. And yet, which is wonderful, do all entertain the Belief and Expectation of a *future State*. A Miracle that can be accounted for no other Way, than by what has been said above of the Legislator's principal Concern in the Support of the Doctrine; and of the deep Root it takes in the Mind of Man, when once it is received, by its agreeable Nature. So that though, as we have observed, *no Religion ever existed without the Doctrine of a future State, yet the Doctrine of a future State has existed without Religion.*

SECT. V.

HITHERTO we have shewn the Magistrate's Care in propagating the Belief of a God, and his Providence over human Affairs; and of the Manner in which it is dispensed, namely, by Rewards and Punishments in a *future State*. These things make up the Essence of Religion, and compose the Body of it.

His next Care was for the better Support of Religion so composed. And this was done by uniting it to the State, taking it under the civil Protection, and giving it the Rights and Privileges of an *Establishment*. Accordingly, we find all States and People in the ancient World, had an ESTABLISHED RELIGION; which was under the more immediate Protection of the Civil Magistrate, in contradistinction to those that were only TOLERATED.

How close these two Interests were united in the *Egyptian* Policy, is notorious to all acquainted with Antiquity. Nor were the politest free States less solicitous for the common Interests of the two Societies, than that sage and powerful Monarchy, the Nurse of Arts and Virtue; as we shall see hereafter in the Conduct both of *Rome* and *Athens*, for the Support and Preservation of the *established* Worship.

But an *established Religion* is the universal Voice of Nature: and not confined to certain Ages, People, or Religions. That great Voyager and sensible Observer of the different Manners of Mankind, *J. Baptiste Tavernier* speaking of the Kingdom of *Tunquin*, thus delivers himself: “ I come now to
“ the political Description of this Kingdom, under
“ which I comprehend the Religion, which is, *al-*
“ *most every where in concert with the Civil Govern-*
“ *ment, for the mutual Support of each other*.”

That the Magistrate *established* Religion, united it to the State, and took it into his immediate Protection for the sake of Civil Society, cannot be questioned; the Advantages to Government being so apparent.

But the Necessity of this Union, for procuring those Advantages, as likewise the Number and Extent of them, are not so easily understood. Nor indeed can they be without a perfect Knowledge of the Nature of an *established Religion*, and of those principles of Equity, ~~on which~~ it is founded. But this might seem foreign to the Subject, had not this Master-piece of human Policy been of late, though

Je viens à la Description politique de ce Royaume, dans laquelle je comprends la Religion, qui est presque en tous lieux de concert avec le Gouvernement Civil pour l'appuy reciproque de l'un & de l'autre. Relation nouvelle du Royaume de Tunquin, c. 19
à la fin

but

but of late, called in Question; after having from the first Institution of Civil Society, quite down to the present Age, been universally practised by Society, and as universally approved by Philosophers and Divines. But the Discoverer of Truth should be always welcome:

“Blest for his Sake be human Reason,
“That came at last, though late in Season”.

Now a Matter of so high Importance being become the Subject of Contradiction; and what in this learned Age is not so? it will not be improper to examine it to the Bottom; as our Question is, the Conduct of Law-givers, and legitimate Magistrates, whose Institutions are to be defended on the Rules of Equity and Justice; not of Tyrants, who set themselves above both: And especially as this Examination is so necessary to a thorough Knowledge of the Civil Advantages, resulting from an *established Religion*.

We must at present then, lay aside our Ideas of the ancient Modes of Civil and Religious Societies, and search what they are, in themselves, by Nature; and thence erect the Institution in Question.

We shall do this in as few Words as possible; and refer those, who desire to see a fuller Account of this Matter, to a Discourse published separately upon it, intituled, *The Alliance between Church and State*.

In the Beginning of the first Book, where we speak of the Origin of Civil Society, the Reader may remember we have shewn the natural Deficiency of its Plan; and how the Influence and Sanction of *Religion* only can supply that Defect.

Religion then being-proved necessary to Society, that it should be so used and applied, in the best

h Prior.

Way,

Way, and to most Advantage, needs no Proof. For it is as Instinctive in our Nature to improve a good, as to investigate and pursue it. And with Regard to this particular good, there is special Reason why its Improvement should be studied. For the Experience of every Place and Age informs us, that the Coactivity of *Civil Laws* and *Religion*, is little enough to keep Men from running into Confusion.

But this Improvement is the Effect of Art and Contrivance. For all natural good, every thing, constitutionally beneficial to Man, needs Man's Industry to make it better. We receive it all at the provident Hand of Heaven, rather with a Capacity of being applied to our Use, than immediately fit for Service. We receive it indeed, in full Measure, but rude and unprepared.

Now, concerning this technical Improvement of moral good, it is in artificial Bodies as in natural. Two may be so essentially constituted, as to be greatly able to adorn and strengthen each other: But then, as in the one Case, a mere juxtaposition of the Parts is not sufficient; so neither is it in the other: Some Union, some Coalition, some artful Insertion into each other will be necessary.

But now again, as in natural Bodies, the Artist knows not how to set about the proper Operation, till he has acquired a reasonable Knowledge of the Nature of those Bodies, which are the Subject of his Skill; so neither can we know in what Manner Religion may be best applied to the Service of the State, till we have learned the real and essential Nature both of a State and a Religion. The obvious Qualities of both sufficiently shew that they must needs have a good Effect on each other, when properly applied. As our Artist, by his Knowledge of the obvious Qualities of two natural Bodies,

dies,

dies, we suppose, discerns the same; though he has not yet got Acquaintance enough with their Nature, to make a right Application.

It behoves us therefore to gain a proper Knowledge of the Nature of a *Civil* and *Religious* Society.

I. To begin with *Civil Society*: It was instituted either with the Purpose of attaining all the good of every kind, it was even accidentally capable of producing; or only of some certain good, which the Institutors aimed at, without having any Consideration to other in their Scheme. To suppose its End the vague Purpose of acquiring even all possible accidental good, is, in Politics, the highest Solecism imaginable; as hath been sufficiently proved by the Writers on this Questionⁱ. And how untrue in Fact, may be gathered from what has been said in the Beginning, of the Origin of Society. Civil Society then, I suppose, will be allowed to have been instituted for the Attainment of some precise determined End, or Ends. If so; then for some, without Consideration had to others. Which again, infers the Necessity of distinguishing this End from others. But the Distinction can arise only from the different Properties of the Things pretending. But again, amongst all those things, which are apt to obtrude, or have, in Fact, obtruded upon Men, as the Ends of Civil Society; there is but one Difference in their Properties, as Ends, which is this: *That one of these is attainable by Civil Society only, and all the Rest are with equal Ease attainable without it.* The thing then with the first mentioned Property, must needs be that genuine, precise, determinate End of *Civil Society*. And what is that but the SECURITY OF THE TEMPORAL LIBERTY AND PROPERTY OF MAN?

ⁱ See *Locke's Defenses of his Letters on Toleration.*

For this, as we have shewn, Civil Society was invented ; and this Civil Society alone is able to procure. The great, but spurious Rival of this End, the SALVATION OF SOULS, or the Security of Man's future Happiness, is therefore excluded from this Part of the Division. For this not depending on outward Accidents, or on the Will or Power of another, as the Body and Goods do, may be as well attained in a State of Nature, as in Civil Society ; and therefore on the Principles here delivered, cannot be one of the Causes of the Institution of Civil Society ; nor consequently one of the Ends thereof. But if so, the Promotion of it comes not within the peculiar Province of the Civil Magistracy.

II. Secondly, as to Religious Society, or a Church. This being instituted to preserve Purity of Faith and Worship, its ultimate End is the SALVATION OF SOULS. From whence it follows,

I. *That this Society must needs be SOVEREIGN and INDEPENDENT ON THE CIVIL.* Natural Dependency of one Society on another, must arise either from the *Law of Nature or of Nations*. Dependency by the *Law of Nature*, is from *Essence or Generation*. Dependency from *Essence* there can be none here. For this kind of Dependency being a Mode of natural Union and Coalition ; and Coalition being only where there is an Agreement in *eodem tertio* ; and there being no such Agreement between two Societies essentially different, as these are, there can possibly be no Dependency. Dependency from *Generation* is where one Society springs up from another ; as Corporations, Colleges, Companies, and Chambers in a City. These, as well by the Conformity of their Ends and Means, as by their Charters of Incorporation, betray their Original and Dependency. But Religious Society, by
Ends

Ends and Means quite different, gives internal Proof of its not arising from the State; and by external, it appears that it existed before the State had any Being. Again, no Dependency can arise from the *Law of Nations*, or the *Civil Law*. Dependency by this Law is, where one and the same People, composing two different Societies, the *Imperium* of the one clashes with the *Imperium* of the other. For in such Case, the lesser Society becomes by that Law dependent on the greater, because the not being so, would make that great Absurdity in Politics, called *Imperium in Imperio*. But now Civil and Religious Society, having Ends and Means entirely different, and the Means of Civil Society being coercive Power, which Power therefore the Religious consequently hath not; it follows, that the Administration of each Society is exercised in so remote Spheres, that they can never possibly meet to Clash. And those Societies which never Clash, necessity of State can never bring into Dependency on one another.

2. It follows, *That this independent Religious Society hath not, in and of itself, any coercive Power of the Civil kind*: Its inherent Authority and Powers being in their Nature and Use entirely different from those of the State. For if, as hath been proved, Civil Society was instituted for the Attainment of one Species of Good, all other good requisite to human Happiness, being to be attained without that Society; and that Civil Society attains the good, for which it was instituted, by the sole Means of coercive Power; then it follows, that the good, which any other kind of Society seeks, may be attained without that Power; consequently, coercive Power is unnecessary to a Religious Society. But that Means, which is *unnecessary* for the Attainment of any End, is likewise *unfit* in all Cases, but in that,

that, where such unnecessary Means is supplied by other of the same Kind or Species. But Religious Society attains its End by Means of a different kind. Again, Ends, in their Nature different, can never be attained by one and the same Means. Thus in the Case before us: Coercive Power can only influence to outward Practice; by outward Practice only is the good Civil Society aims at, immediately effected; therefore is coercive Power peculiarly fit for Civil Society. But the good Religious Society aims at, cannot be effected by outward Practice; therefore coercive Power is altogether *unfit* for that Society.

Having thus by a diligent Enquiry found,

I. First, *That the Care of the Civil Society extends only to the Body, and its Concerns; and the Care of the Religious Society only to the Soul*: it necessarily follows, that the Civil Magistrate, if he will improve this natural Influence of Religion by human Art and Contrivance, must seek some UNION or ALLIANCE with the Church. For his Office not extending to the Care of Souls, he hath not, in himself, power to enforce the Influence of Religion: and the Church's Province not extending to the Body, and consequently without coactive Power; she has not, in herself alone, a Power of applying that Influence to Civil Purposes. The Consequence is, that their joint Powers must be employed thus to inforce and apply the Influence of Religion. But they can never act conjointly but in *Union* and *Alliance*.

II. Secondly, having found *that each Society is Sovereign, and independent on the other*, it as necessarily follows, that such *Union* can be produced only by FREE CONVENTION AND MUTUAL COMPACT: because, whatever is Sovereign and Independent, can be brought to no Act without its
own

own Consent: but nothing can give birth to a *free Convention*, but a Sense of mutual Wants, that may be supplied; or a View of mutual Benefits, that may be gained by it.

Such then is the Nature of that famous Union which produces a RELIGION BY LAW ESTABLISHED: and which is, indeed, no other than a *public League or Alliance for mutual Support and Defense*. For the State, not having the Care of Souls, cannot itself enforce the Influence of Religion; and, therefore seeks the concurring Aid of the Church: And the Church having no coercive Power, the Consequence of its Care's not extending to Bodies, as naturally flies for Protection to the State: this being of that Kind of *Alliance* which *Grotius* calls FOEDUS INÆQUALE — “Inæquale foedus (says he) “hic intelligo quod ex ipsa vi pactiois *manentem* “*prælationem* quandam alteri donat: hoc est ubi “quis tenetur alterius imperium ac majestatem “conservare UT POTENTIORI PLUS HONORIS, “INFERIORI PLUS AUXILII DEFERATUR¹.”

An *Alliance*, then, by *free Convention*, being in its Nature such that each Party must have its Motives for compacting; our next Enquiry will be,

I. What those Motives were, which the State had of seeking, and the Church of accepting the Offers of an Union: And,

II. The mutual Benefits and Advantages thereby gained.

The Motives the State had to seek the *Alliance*, were of three Kinds:

I. To preserve the Essence and Purity of Religion.

II. To improve its Usefulness, and apply its Utility in the best manner.

¹ *De Jure Bell, & Pac.* 1. 1. c. 3. § 21.

III. To prevent the Mischief that in its natural independent State it might occasion to Society.

I. The State was induced to seek it, 1. *As the necessary Means of preserving the Being of Religion.* For though, as we have shewn in the Treatise of the Alliance, that Religion constitutes a Society; and that this Society will indeed, for some time, support the Existence of Religion, which without constituting a Community would be soon lost, and vanish from amongst Men; yet, if we consider that this Society is composed of the same Individuals which compose the Civil, and destitute of all coactive Power; we must needs see, that such a Society, abandoned to its own Fortune, without Support or Protection, would in no long time be swallowed up and lost. Of this Opinion was a very able Writer, whose Knowledge of human Nature was unquestionable: *Were it not, says he, for that Sense of Virtue, which is principally preserved, so far as it is preserved, BY NATIONAL FORMS AND HABITS OF RELIGION, Men would soon lose it all, run wild, prey upon one another, and do what else the worst of Savages do^k.*

2. But of whatsoever Use an Alliance may be thought for preserving the Being of Religion, the Necessity of it for preserving its Purity, is most evident: For if Truth and public Utility coincide, the nearer any Religion approaches to the Truth of Things, the fitter is that Religion for serving Civil Society. That they do coincide, may be demonstrated on any Principles but the Atheistic; and therefore we think it needless, in this Place, to draw out the Proof in Form: Let us then consider the Danger Religion runs, when left in its natural State to itself, of deviating from Truth.

^k *Wollaston's Religion of Nature delineated*, pag. 124. Quarto Edit. 1725.

In those Circumstances, the Men who have the greatest Credit in the Church, are such as are famed for greatest Sanctity. Now *Church Sanctity* has been generally understood to be then most perfect, when most *estranged from the World*, and all its Habitudes and Relations. But this Species of Sanctity being to be acquired only by Secession and Retirement from human Affairs; and that Secession rendering the *holy Man* ignorant of Civil Society, and its Rights and Interests; in place of which will succeed, according to his natural Temper, all the Follies of Superstition or Fanaticism; we must needs conclude, that Religion under such Directors and Reformers, and God knows these are generally its Lot, will deviate from Truth; and consequently from a Capacity in proportion of serving Civil Society. I wish I could not say we have too much Fact to support this Speculation. The Truth is, we have seen, and yet do see Religious Societies, *some* grown up, and continuing unsupported by, and ununited with the State; *others*, that, when supported and united, have by strange Arts brought the State into Subjection, and become its Tyrants and Usurpers; and thereby *defeated* all the Good that can arise from this Alliance: Such Societies, I say, we have seen, whose Religious Doctrines are so little serviceable to Civil Society, that they can prosper only on the Ruin and Destruction of it: such are those which teach *the Sanctity of Celibacy and Ascetecism, the Sinfulness of defensive War, of capital Punishments, and even of Civil Magistracy itself.*

On the other hand, when Religion is in *Alliance* with the State, as it then comes under the Magistrate's Direction, those holy Leaders having now neither Credit nor Power to do Mischief, its Purity must needs be reasonably well supported and

R preserved:

preserved : For Truth and public Utility coinciding, the Civil Magistrate, as such, will see it for his Interest to seek after and promote Truth in Religion: and by means of public Utility, which his Office enables him so well to understand, he will never be at a Loss to know where such Truth is to be found: So that it is impossible, under this Civil Influence, for Religion ever to deviate far from Truth; always supposing, for on such a Supposition this whole Theory proceeds, a *legitimate* Government, or Civil Policy, established on the Principles of the natural Rights and Liberties of Mankind: For an unequal and unjust Government, which seeks its own, not public Utility, will always have occasion for Error, and so must corrupt Religion to serve its own wrong Interests.

I am sorry I must here obviate an *Objection*, that could not, one would think, I will not say arise in the Mind of any candid Examiner, for that it could not, but be urged by any one who had regard to the Reputation of common Sense: It is, *That the State's Motive of preserving the Being and Purity of Religion, clashes with the great Principle, on which this Theory of the Alliance goes, namely, that the End the State had in establishing a Church, was not to provide for the true Religion, but Civil Utility.* For is it not one Consequence of this *Principle*, that whatever tends to advance public Utility, will be a Motive to the State in seeking the Alliance? But I have shewn *Religion* to be absolutely necessary to the State: Would not one Motive then in the State's seeking the Alliance needs be *for the better preserving its Being and Essence*? Again, when I speak of the State, do not I say, I mean a *legitimate Policy* that ever pursues common Utility? But common Utility and Truth, as all Men see,
neces-

necessarily coincide: Would not then another Motive in the State's seeking the Alliance be *for the better preserving the Purity of Religion?* But for what End is this *Being and Purity* promoted by the State? For its own End or the Church's? If for its own, is not that *Civil Utility?*

II. Secondly, the State was induced to seek this Alliance, *as the necessary Means to improve the Usefulness, and to apply the Influence of Religion in the best manner.* And this it does several Ways.

1. By bestowing additional Reverence and Veneration on the Person of the Civil Magistrate, and on the Laws of the State. For, in this Alliance, where the Religious Society is taken under the Protection of the State, the supreme Magistrate, as will be shewn hereafter, is acknowledged *Head of the Religion.* Now nothing can be imagined of greater Efficacy for securing the Obedience of the People. Those two consummate Masters in Politics, *Aristotle and Machiavel*, as we have seen, thought it of so great, as to be sufficient to gain Reverence and Security to a Tyrant. What then must we suppose its Efficacy on a legitimate Magistrate? The same Veneration will extend itself over the *Laws* likewise: For while some of them are employed by the State for the *Support of the Church*, and others *lent* to the Church to be employed in the *State's Service*, and all of them enacted by a *Legislature, in which Churchmen have a considerable Share* (all these Things being amongst the Conditions of *Alliance*) Laws, under such Direction, must needs be obeyed with greater Reverence.

2. By lending to the Church a *coactive Power.* — It may be remembered, that, in speaking of the innate Defects in the Plan of Civil Society, we observed, there were several Sorts of Duties that Civil Laws could not enforce; such as the Duties of

IMPERFECT OBLIGATION, which a Religious Society, when endowed with *coactive Power* to invigorate the Influence of Religion, is capable of exacting: and SUCH likewise of the Duties of PERFECT OBLIGATION, whose Breach is owing to the Intemperance of the natural Passions; the severe Prohibition of which threatens greater and more enormous Evils: For while these violent Passions overflow, the stopping them in one place is causing them to break out with greater Violence in another. As the rigorous Punishment of Fornication has been generally seen to give birth to unnatural Lusts. The effectual Correction of such Evils must be begun by moderating and subduing the Passions themselves. But this Civil Laws are not understood to prescribe, as punishing those Passions only when they proceed to act, and not rewarding the Attempts to subdue them: It must be a Tribunal regarding irregular Intentions as criminal, which can do this; and that is no other than the Tribunal of Religion. When this is done, a coactive Power of the Civil Kind may have a good Effect; but not 'till then: And who so fit to apply this coactive Power, in such Cases, as that Society, which fitted and prepared the Subject for its due Reception and Application? Again, we have observed¹, that the State punishes Deviations from the Rule of Right as *Crimes* only, and not as such Deviations, or as *Sins*; and on that first Idea proportions its Punishments: By which Means some very enormous Deviations from the Rule of Right, which do not immediately affect Civil Society, and so are not considered as *Crimes*, are overlooked by the Civil Tribunal: Yet these, *mediately*, being highly pernicious to the State, it is

¹ See *The Alliance*, part 1. § 4.

for its Interests that they should be brought before some Tribunal, which can commodiously take Cognizance of them. *Hence may be deduced the true and only End and Use of SPIRITUAL COURTS.* A Church Tribunal then, with coactive Power, being necessary in all these Cases; and a Religious Society having in itself no such Power, it must be borrowed from the State: But a State cannot lend it, without risking its own Destruction, *but on the Terms of an Alliance*; therefore will a State be induced to seek this Alliance, in order to improve, by this Way, the natural Efficacy of Religion.

3. *By conferring on the State the Application of the Efficacy of Religion, and by putting it under the Magistrate's Direction.* — There are peculiar Junctures when the Influence of Religion is more than ordinarily serviceable to the State: and these the Civil Magistrate only knows. Now while a Church is in its natural State of Independency, it is not in his Power to improve those Conjunctions to the Advantage of the State, by a proper Application of Religion: But when the *Alliance* is made, and consequently the Church under his Direction, he has then Authority to prescribe such public Exercises of Religion, and in such a manner as he finds the Exigences of State require^m.

4. *By engaging the Church to apply its utmost Endeavours in the Service of the State.* For an *Alliance* laying an Obligation on the State to protect and defend the Church, and to provide a settled Maintenance for its Ministers, such Benefits must needs produce the highest Love and Esteem for the Benefactor: which will be returned; out of Motives

^m See the scandalous Squabbles between the Civil Magistrate and the Church, concerning the Exercise of this Power, in the Histories of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

both of Gratitude and Interest, in the most zealous Labours for the State's Service.

III. Lastly, *the State was induced to seek this Alliance, as the only Means of preventing the Mischiefs that, in its natural independent Condition, it might occasion to Civil Society.* For, in that State, the Church having, in itself a Power of assembling for religious Worship, factious Men might commodiously, under that Cover, hatch and carry on Cabals and Plots against the Peace of Civil Society : And the Influence popular and leading Men gain over the Consciences of such Assemblies, by means of the Frequency of public Harangues, may easily ripen these Contrivances into Act, when strengthened with the specious Pretext of Religion : all which Evils are entirely prevented by this *Alliance*. For then, the Civil Magistrate being become Protector of the Church, and, consequently, supreme Head and Director of it, the Ministry is wholly in his Power : that mutual Dependency between the Clergy and People being, by the Means of a settled Revenue, quite broke and destroyed. He admits and excludes to the *Exercise* of their Function, as he sees fit ; and grants it to none, but such as give a previous Security for their Allegiance to him : By which Means, all that Power and Influence, which the Ministers and Leaders in a Church had over it before the Alliance, *as the Protectors of Religion*, is now drawn off from them, and placed solely in the Civil Magistrate.

Another Mischief there is still more certain and fatal, whenever above one Religion is found in a State ; which an *Alliance* only can prevent : For every Sect or Church, in these latter Ages, thinking itself alone the true, or at least the most perfect, is naturally pushed on to advance its own Scheme on the Ruin of all the rest : So that if this
succeeds

succeeds not by *Argument*, they are apt to have recourse to Civil Power: which is done by introducing a Party into the *Public Administration*: And we find, they have been but too successful in the Art of making the State believe, that *its* Interests are much concerned in these religious Differences. Into what frequent and strong Convulsions these Contentions must throw the State, may be easily apprehended. Now, to these Mischiefs an *Alliance* is the most effectual Remedy; by *establishing one Church*, and giving a *full Toleration to the rest*: but *excluding their Members from the public Administration*, from the Admission into which these Disorders arise.

Having now delivered the principal Motives that engaged the State to *seek an Alliance* with the Church;

We come, in the next Place, to consider the Motives the Church had for *accepting* it. For this being, as we observed, a FREE CONVENTION, unless the Church as well as State, had its Views of Advantage, no *Alliance* could possibly have been formed. To discover these Motives, we must recollect what hath been said of the Nature and End of a *Religious Society*: For the Advantage adapted to that Nature and End, can only be her legitimate View; consequently this Advantage can be no other than SECURITY FROM ALL EXTERIOR VIOLENCE. The State indeed could not justly offer any to it, had this *Alliance* never been made: but this is no Reason why the Church should not think it for its Interest to secure this its natural Right by *Compact*; any more than that one State should not bind another, in the same manner, not to do it Violence, though *that other* was under prior Obligations, by the Law of Nature and Nations, to the same purpose.

But by this *Alliance* between the two Societies, the State does more : it not only promises not to injure the Church confederated, but to serve it ; that is, protect it from the Injuries of other Religious Societies. How one Religious Society may be injuriously affected by another, we have just before shewn ; and how great those Injuries may prove, will be shewn hereafter. It must needs then be the first Care of a Church, and a *reasonable Care*, to preserve itself, by all lawful Ways, from exterior Violence. A State then, as hath been said, to induce her to accept its Offers of *Alliance*, must propose some Benefit to the Church by it : and because this is the only legitimate Benefit the Church can receive, it must propose *this* ; which, therefore, being considerable, will be the Church's *Motive for Alliance*.

There are but two other Considerations that can be thought *Motives* : The one, *to engage the State to propagate the Established Religion by Civil Force* ; and the other, *to bestow Honours, Riches, and Power upon it*. Now, on recurring to the Nature and End of a Church and State, the *first* Motive will be found *unjust* ; and the *second* *impertinent*. It is *unjust* in the Church to require this Engagement ; because it would be violating the natural Right every Man has of worshipping God according to his own Conscience. It is *unjust* in the State to engage in it ; because, as we have shewn, his Jurisdiction extends not to Opinions. It is *impertinent* in a Church to aim at Riches, Honours, Powers, &c. because these are Things which, as a Church, it cannot be benefited by : for they have no natural Tendency to promote the ultimate End of this Society, *Salvation of Souls* ; nor the immediate End, *Purity of Worship*. We conclude therefore, that the only
legi-

legitimate Motive she could have, was *Security and Protection from outward Violence.*

On these mutual Motives it was, that this famous Alliance was formed ; which gave birth to a CHURCH BY LAW ESTABLISHED.

Now as from the Nature of the two Societies we discovered what Kind of Union only they could enter into ; so from thence, together with the Motives they had in uniting, may be deduced, by necessary Consequence, the reciprocal TERMS and Conditions of that Union.

From the Motives thereto it appears, that the great *Preliminary or Fundamental Article* of the *Alliance* is, that THE CHURCH SHALL APPLY ALL ITS INFLUENCE IN THE SERVICE OF THE STATE ; and that THE STATE SHALL SUPPORT AND PROTECT THE CHURCH.

But in order to the Performance of this Agreement, there must necessarily be a *mutual Communication of their respective Powers.* For the Province of each Society being naturally distinct and different, each can have to do in the other's but by mutual Concession.

But again, these Societies being likewise as naturally independent one on the other, a mutual Concession cannot be safely made, without one of them, at the same time, giving up to the other its Right of Independency : From whence arises what *Grotius* we see calls *MANENS PRÆLATIO* ; which, in his *Fædus inæquale*, the more powerful Society hath over the less.

Now from these two Conclusions, which spring necessarily from *the great fundamental Article of Union*, we consequentially deduce all the Terms, Conditions, mutual Grants, and Concessions, which complet this *Alliance*.

For from this Obligation on the Church *to apply its Influence in the Service of the State*, proceed a SETTLED MAINTENANCE FOR THE MINISTERS OF RELIGION; and an ECCLESIASTICAL JURISDICTION with *coactive* Power; which Things introduce again on the other Side, the Dependency of the Clergy on the State: And from the State's Obligation *to support and protect the Church*, proceeds the ECCLESIASTICAL SUPREMACY OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE; which again introduces, on the other hand, the Right of CHURCH-MEN TO PARTAKE OF THE LEGISLATURE.

Thus are all these mutual Rights and Privileges closely interwoven and connected with each other, by a necessary reciprocal Dependency.

But to be more particular in the Grounds and Reasons of each Grant and Privilege, we will now, in a different and more commodious Order for this purpose, examine,

I. What the Church receives from the State.

II. What it gives to it.

Which will present us with *a new View of the two Societies, as they appear under an Establishment*; and leave nothing wanting to enable us to judge thoroughly of their Natures.

I. What the Church receives from the State by this *Alliance*, is,

1. First, *a public and settled Endowment for the Clergy*. The Reasons of it are, 1. To render the Religious Society more firm and durable. 2. To invite and encourage the Clergy's best Service to the State, in rendering those committed to their Care, virtuous. But, 3. and principally, in order to destroy that mutual Dependency between the Clergy and People, which arises from the former's being maintained by the voluntary Contribution of the latter; the only Maintenance the Clergy could have,

have, before the two Societies were allied ; and which Dependence we have shewn to be productive of great Mischiefs to the State. Add to all this, that as the Clergy is now under the Magistrate's Direction, and consequently become a public Order in the State, it is but fit and decent, that the State should provide it a public Maintenance.

2. *A Place in the Legislature, for her Representatives the Clergy.* For, as it necessarily follows, as we shall see presently, from that *fundamental Article of Alliance* of the State's supporting and protecting the Church, that the Church must, in return, give up its *Independency to the State*, whereby the State becomes empowered to determine in all Church Matters, so far as relates to it as a Society ; as this, I say, necessarily follows, the Church must needs have its Representatives in the Court of Legislature, to prevent that Power, which the State receives in return for the Protection it affords, from being perverted to the Church's Injury : For the Church's giving up its *Independency*, without reserving a Right of Presentation in the Legislature, would be making itself, instead of a *Subject*, a *Slave* to the State. Besides, without these Representatives, no Laws could be made in the Court of Legislature concerning the Church : because no free Man, or Body, can be bound by Laws, to which they have not given their Consent, either in Person, or by Representative. So that, as the Church cannot justly, we may presume, she did not willingly, when she entred into *Alliance*, give up her *Independency*, without reserving to herself this Privilege.

3: *An Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, enforced by Civil coactive Power, FOR THE REFORMATION OF MANNERS.* For it being one of the preliminary Articles of this *Alliance*, that the Church should apply all its Influence in the Service of the State, and its

its Influence being best, and most efficaciously applied this Way ; there was a Necessity for the Erection of such a Court. For it has been shewn above, that there are a numerous Set of Duties, both of *perfect* and *imperfect* Obligation, which human Laws could not reach and inforce ; which yet the Good of Civil Society requires should be reached and inforced ; and which an Ecclesiastical Tribunal, intrusted with coactive Power, can alone do. And indeed, the supplying those Defects, which these Courts do supply, was the *original and fundamental* Motive of the State's seeking the *Alliance*. Again, it appears to be very fit the Church should be strengthened with this Authority, that it might not be left contemptibly naked, after having given up its Supremacy to the State.

II. Let us now see what the Church gives to the State. It is in a word this : *The making the Civil Magistrate her supreme Head, without whose Approbation and Allowance she can direct, order, and decree nothing.* For the State having, by this *Alliance*, undertaken the Protection of the Church, and Protection not being to be afforded to any Person or Body, without Power over that Person or Body in the Person or Body protecting ; it necessarily follows that the *Civil Magistrate must be supreme.* Besides, when the State, by this Convention, covenanted to afford the Church Protection, that Covenant was made to a particular Church of one Denomination, of such determined Doctrine and Discipline. But now, what might be advantageous to the State, in the Protection of such a Church, might be disadvantageous to it, in the Protection of one of a different Doctrine and Discipline : Therefore, when Protection is afforded, it must be at the same time provided, that no Alteration be made therein, without the State's Allowance.

lowance. Farther, the State having *endowed its Clergy*, and bestowed upon it a *Jurisdiction with co-active Power*; these are Privileges that might be perverted to the infinite Damage of the State, had not the Civil Magistrate, in return, the *Supremacy of the Church*. It would, indeed, be no less than an *Imperium in Imperio*. The Necessity of the Thing then invests him with the Title.

Thus have we shewn the mutual Privileges *given and received* by Church and State, in entering into this famous Convention: The Aim of the State being, agreeably to its Nature, *Utility*; and the Aim of the Church, agreeably to her's, *Truth*. From whence we may observe, that as they all took their Rise, by necessary Consequence, from the fundamental Article of the Convention, which is, *that the Church should serve the State, and the State protect the Church*; so they receive all possible Addition of Strength from the mutual Dependency they have on one another. This we have reason to desire may be understood as a certain Mark that our *Plan of Alliance* is no precarious arbitrary Hypothesis, but a *Theory*, founded in Nature, and the invariable Nature of Things. For having from the real Essence of the two Societies collected the *Necessity* of an Alliance, and the *Freedom* of it; from the *Necessity*, we have fairly introduced it; and from its End and *Freedom*, consequentially established every mutual Term and Condition of it. So that now if the Reader should ask us, *where this Charter or Treaty of Convention for the Union of the two Societies, on the Terms here delivered, is to be met with*; we are enabled to satisfy him: For we say, it may be found in the same Archive with the famous ORIGINAL COMPACT between Magistrate and People; so much insisted on in the Vindication of the common Rights of Subjects. Now, when
a Sight

a Sight of this *Compact* is required of the Defenders of Civil Liberty, they hold it to the Purpose to say, that it is sufficient to all the Purposes of Fact and Right, that that *original Compact* is the only legitimate Foundation of Civil Society: That if there was no such Thing *formally* executed, there was *virtually*: That all Differences between Magistrate and People, ought to be regulated on the Supposition of such a Compact; and all Government reduced to the Principles therein laid down: For, that all the Happiness, of which Civil Society is productive, can only be attained by it when formed on those Principles. Now something like this we say of our ALLIANCE BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.

Hitherto we have considered this *Alliance* under its most simple Form; *i. e.* where there is but *one* Religion in the State: But it may so happen, that, either at the time of Convention, or afterwards, there may be *more than one*.

1. If there be *more than one at the Time of Convention*, the *Alliance* is made by the State with the *largest* of the Religious Societies. It is *fit* it should be so, because the larger the Society is, where there is an Equality in other Points, the better enabled it will be to answer the Ends of the *Alliance*; as having the greatest Number under its Influence. It is *scarce possible* it should be otherwise; because the two Societies being composed of the same Individuals, the greatly prevailing Religion must have a Majority of its Members in the Assemblies of State; who will naturally prefer their own Religion to all others. With *this* is the *Alliance* made, and a full *Toleration* given to all the rest; but restrained from injuring that which is *established*, by the Guard of a TEST LAW.

2. If

2. If these different Religions arise *after* the Alliance hath been formed, whenever they become considerable, *then* is a *Test Law* necessary, for the Security of the established Church. For when there are Diversities of Religion in a State, each of which thinks itself the only true, or at least the most pure; every one aims at advancing itself on the Ruins of the rest; and when Reason fails, attempts to do it by the Civil Aid: which can be only brought about by the Attempter's getting into the Public Administration. But when it happens that one of these Religions is the *established*, and all the rest under a *Toleration*; then it is that these latter still more inflamed, and stimulated with Envy at the Advantages the established Church enjoys, act in Concert, and proceed with joint Attacks to disturb its Peace. In this imminent Danger the Established Church demands the Aid of the State, which gives her a *Test Law* for her Security.

Thus the TEST LAW took its birth, whether at or *after* the Time of the *Alliance*. That the State is under the highest Obligations of Justice and Necessity to provide this Security, we shall shew.

1. By that *Alliance*, the State promised to protect the Church from all Injuries. It is evident, that an Attempt in the Members of any other Church to get into the Administration, in order to deprive the established Church of the Rights it enjoys, if it succeeds, is an Injury: And we have shewn that, where there are Diversities of Religions, this Attempt will be perpetually making. If therefore the State will perform its Promise of Protection, it must defeat that Attempt: But there is no other Way of defeating it, than by hindering its Enemies from entering into the Administration: but they can be hindered only by a *Test Law*.

2. Farther,

2. Farther, this Promise of Protection becomes absolutely indispensable. For Protection was not only made by the Church a Condition of *Alliance*, but the *sole* Condition of it : For we have shewn, that all other Benefits and Advantages are foreign to a Church, as such, and improper for it. Now the not performing the *sole Condition* of a Convention, virtually destroys and dissolves it : And this *sole Condition* can be neither *unnecessary*, nor *unjust* : Not *unnecessary* ; because a free Convention must have *mutual* Conditions ; and this being the *sole Condition* of one Party, it must needs be necessary : Not *unjust* ; because having proved the Convention itself to be founded on the Laws of Nature and Nations, in which Convention mutual Conditions are necessary, and that no other Conditions suit the Nature of a Church, it follows that this is *just*.

3. But still farther : The State's Obligation to perform its Promise, is vastly enforced by this additional Consideration. The Church, in order to enable the State to perform this *sole Condition* of Protection, consented to the giving up its Supremacy, and Independency to the State : Whence it follows, that whenever the Enemies of the established Church get into the Magistrature, to which, as we have said, the Supremacy of the Church is transferred by the *Alliance*, she becomes a Prey to them, and lies entirely at their Mercy ; being now, by the Loss of her Supremacy, in no Condition of Defense, as she was in her natural State, unprotected and independent : So that the not securing her by a *Test Law*, is betraying her, and delivering her up bound to her Enemies.

4. But lastly, had no Promise of Protection been made to the Church, yet the State, for its own Security, would have lain under the most indispensable Necessity of providing a *Test Law*, when

it had made an Alliance. It has been observed, that wherever there are Diversities of Religions, each Sect, believing its own the truest, strives to advance itself on the Ruins of the rest. If this doth not succeed by dint of Argument, the Partisans are very apt to have recourse to the coercive Power of the State: which is done by introducing a Party into the Public Administration. And they have always had Art and Address enough to make the State believe that its Interests were much concerned in the Success of their religious Disputes. What Persecutions, Rebellions, Revolutions, Loss of Civil and Religious Liberty, these intestine Struggles between Sects have produced, is well known to those acquainted with the History of Mankind. To prevent these Mischiefs was, as we have shewn, one great Motive of the State's seeking *Alliance* with the Church: for the obvious Remedy was the *Establishing one Church*, and giving a general *Toleration to the rest*. But if, in administering this *Remedy*, the State should stop short, and not proceed to exclude the *tolerated* Religions from entering into the Public Administration, such imperfect Application of it would infinitely heighten the Distemper: For, before the *Alliance*, it was only a mistaken Aim in propagating Truth, that occasioned these Disorders; but now, the Zeal for Opinions would be, out of measure, inflamed by Envy and Emulation; which the temporal Advantages, enjoyed by the established Church, exclusive of the rest, always give birth to: And what Confusion this would produce, had every Sect free Entry into the Administration, is easier conceived than expressed. If it be said, that, would Men content themselves with enjoying their own Opinions, without endeavouring to obtrude them upon others, as Reason dictates they should, these Evils would never hap-

pen; and consequently there would be no occasion for a *Test Law*: Right; and so would Men but observe the Rule of Justice in general, there would be no need to have recourse to Civil Society, to remedy the Neglect.

In a Word, an *Established Religion and a Test Law* is the universal Voice of Nature. The most barbarous Nations have employed it to civilize their Manners; and the Politest knew no other Way to prevent their Return to Barbarity and Confusion.

Thus the Democracy of *Athens*, so humane and free, exacted an Oath of every Citizen for the Security of the established Religion: which was conceived in these Words: “I will not dishonour the *Sacred Arms*”, nor desert my Comrade in Battle: “I will DEFEND AND PROTECT MY COUNTRY AND MY RELIGION, whether alone, or in Conjunction with others: I will not desert the Public, while in a worse Condition than when I entered into its Service, but will leave it better

ⁿ “Ὅπλα τὰ Ἱερά, the *Sacred Arms*. It was a general Custom in Greece, borrowed, as were several other political ones, from *Crete*, for every Man of Fashion or Quality to have a Youth for his Favourite, whose Manners and Education he had the Care of forming. This was esteemed of so great Service to the Public, that it was encouraged by the Laws which provided against the Abuses, to which it was liable. The usual Present the Lover made the Youth, was a Suit of Arms, as they generally fought together in Battle. The *Thebans* had a whole Band of Three Hundred of these Lovers and their Youths; which was called ἱερὰ φάλαγγξ, the *sacred Phalanx*; which had performed Wonders, and at last fell together in the Battle of *Cheronea*. *Philip*, who saw them all lie dead on the same Spot where they had fought his whole *Phalanx*, could not forbear saying, let them perish who suspect that these either did or suffered any thing base. They who would see a full Account of this very extraordinary Institution, may consult the 9th Chap. 4th Book of that excellent Collection of *Greek Antiquities*, intituled *Archæologia Græca*. — To this Custom, I take it, the ὅπλα τὰ Ἱερά alludes: these *Sacred Arms* being what the Lovers had presented to their favourite Youths.

“than

“ than I found it : I will be always ready to obey
 “ the Supreme Magistrate, with Gravity and Mo-
 “ desty ; and to submit to the established Laws,
 “ and to all such as shall be hereafter established
 “ by full Consent of the People : And I will never
 “ connive at any other who shall presume to de-
 “ spise or disobey them ; but will revenge all such
 “ Attempts on the Sanctity of the Republic, either
 “ alone or in Conjunction with the People : And
 “ lastly, I WILL CONFORM TO THE NATIONAL
 “ RELIGION. So help me those Gods who are the
 “ Avengers of Perjury° !

Here we see, that by this Formulary, after every Man had sworn, *I will defend and protect the Religion of my Country*, in Consequence of the Obligation the State lies under to protect the *established Worship* ; he concludes, *I will conform to it* : the most direct and strongest of all Tests.

How careful too the Romans were for the Support of the established Religion, may be seen by a Speech of the Consul *Posthumius* in *Livy*, occasioned by some horrid Abuses committed, through the clandestine Exercise of foreign Worship. *How often*, says he, *in the Times of our Fathers and Forefathers, hath this Affair been recommended to the Magistrates, to prohibit all foreign Worship ; to drive the Priests and Sacrificers from the Cirque, the Forum, and the City : To search up and burn all Books of Prophecies ; and to abolish all Modes of sacrificing,*

ο 'Ου κατ'αρχαῖαν ὅπλα τὰ ἱερὰ, εἰδ' ἐγκαταλείψω τὴν ἀρχαίαν, ὅπως αὖν σιγήσω. AMYNΩ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΥΠΕΡΙΕΡΩΝ, καὶ ὑπερὶ ὅσων καὶ μόνον, καὶ μὴ πολλῶν. τὴν παλαιὰν δὲ ἐκ ἐλάσσω ἀφαιρέσω, πλείονα δὲ καὶ ὕψιον, ὅσων αὖν ἀφαιρέωμαι : καὶ σύντοκον τῷ αἰεὶ κερνέωται ἐμφορῶν, καὶ τοῖς θεομοῖς τοῖς ἰδρυμένοις πείσωμαι, καὶ εἰ τις αἰεὶ ἀλλος πὲρ πολλῶν ἰδρυμένη ὁμοσεργίως, καὶ αἰεὶ τις ἀναγῆται τῶν θεομοῖς ἢ μὴ πείσῃ, ἐκ ἐπιβήσω, ἀμυνῶ δὲ καὶ μόνον, καὶ μὴ πολλῶν. καὶ ἱερὰ τὰ πατρία τιμήσω. ἱεροὶ θεοὶ τῶν. *Joan. Stobæi de Rep. Serm. XLI. p. 243. Lugd. Ed. 1608.*

differing from the Roman Discipline? For these sage and prudent Men, instructed in all kind of divine and human Laws, rightly judged that nothing tended so much to the Overthrow of Religion, as when Men celebrated the Sacred Rites, not after their own Country, but foreign Customs^p.

But when we say, all regular policied States, without Exception, had an *established Religion*, we mean no more than *he* would do, who, deducing the Original of Civil Society, should, in order to persuade Men of the Benefits it produces, affirm that all Nations had a Civil Policy. For, as this Writer could not be supposed to mean that all Nations constituted free States, on the Principles of public Liberty (which yet was the only Society he was labouring to prove was founded on Truth, and productive of public Good) because it is notorious, that the far greater Part of Civil Policies are constituted on different Principles, and for different Ends; so neither would we be understood to mean, when we say all Nations concurred in making this Union, that they all exactly discriminated the Natures, and fairly adjusted the Rights of both Societies, on the Principles here laid down; though an *Establishment* resulting therefrom, be the only one I would be supposed to recommend. On the contrary, I know this Union has been generally made on mistaken Principles; or if not so, has degenerated by Length of Time. And as it was sufficient for that Writer's Purpose, that those Societies,

^p Quoties hoc patrum avorumque ætate negotium est magistratibus datum, ut sacra externa fieri vetarent, sacrificulos vatesque foro, circo, urbe prohiberent; vaticinos libros conquirerent, comburentque; omnem disciplinam sacrificandi, præterquam more Romano, abolerent? Judicabant enim prudentissimi viri omnis divini humanique juris, nihil æque dissolvendæ religionis esse, quam ubi non patrio sed externo ritu sacrificaretur. *Hist. lib. 39.*

good or bad, proved the Sense all Men had of the Benefits resulting from Civil Policy in general, though they were oft mistaken in the Application; so it is for ours, that this universal Concurrence in the two Societies to unite, shews the Sense of Mankind concerning the Utility of such Union. And lastly, as that Writer's Principles are not the less true on account of the general Deviation from them in forming Civil Societies; so may not *these* plain ones of *Alliance*, here delivered; though so few States have suffered themselves to be directed by them in Practice, nor any Man delivered them in Speculation.

Such then is the *Theory* we have offered to the World; of which whoever would see a full Account, and the several Parts of it cleared from Objections, may consult the Treatise mentioned before, intituled, *the Alliance between Church and State*; in which we pretend to have discovered a plain and simple Truth, of the highest Concernment to Civil Society, long lost and hid under the learned Obscurity arising from the Collision of contrary false Principles: And the Reception it has met with from all Lovers of Truth, and of their Country, gives us no Reason to repent our Pains. The only Objection I have heard from such, is, *that it is a Theory that does not exactly tally with Matter of Fact: which few Theories do.* I was at a Loss to conceive how this came to be thought an *Objection*; but apprehend the Mistake to lie here: The Word *Theory* has been appropriated, as it were, to the Explanation of a *natural System*. Now as such Theories are good only in proportion to their Agreement with *Fact*; and as Nature so much withdraws herself from human Search; it is no wonder that it should grow into an Observation, *that few Theories agree with Fact*; and that this should be

esteemed, what it really is, an Objection to any such Theory.

But our Theory is an Explanation of an *artificial*, not a natural *System*: in which not any *one particular System* is the Subject, as in a Theory of Nature; but the *general, abstract one*. For Truth being the End of all kind of Theories, a right one of Nature is to be got only by pursuing Fact; for God is the Author of that System: but in a Theory of an *artificial* System, as this of Politics, the following Fact is no safe Way to Truth, because Man is the Author of that System. Abstract Ideas, and their eternal Relations, are the Guides to lead us to Truth; and *Fact* is, with good Reason, neglected. As therefore the Method we are obliged to pursue, is different, so should the Judgment be, which is passed upon our Theory: its Goodness being estimated, not according to its Agreement with *Fact*, but *Right Reason*. In the former Case the Theory should be regulated by the Fact: in the latter, the Fact by the Theory.

Not that *Fact* is of no Use in the Theories of Politics: on the contrary, it is highly useful. For as this Theory must be founded on the Principles of *Right Reason* to render it *just*, so to satisfy us that it is *real*, no romantic impracticable *Utopia*, it must be supported by *Fact*: that is, it must be shewn that the Policy, explained and justified in the Theory, hath been practised to the Public Benefit and Advantage. This, I take it, is the Use, and the only Use of consulting *Fact* in these kind of Theories. And this I presume would be enough to recommend my Theory of *the Alliance*, was it worse than the public Reception of it will give me leave to suppose it: For it was written with no other View than to furnish every Lover of his Country with reasonable Principles, to oppose to
the

the destructive Fancies of the Enemies of our present happy Establishment : Not to reform the fundamental Constitutions of the State ; but to shew they needed no Reformation : An Attempt which I judged neither irrational, nor unseasonable. In a Word, had I been so fanciful to compose a Theory for the new modeling and regulating States, I could have been content with that Neglect, that is the common Fate of all such visionary Compositions.

The Example, used but now, will illustrate what we have been saying. The *Theory* of Civil Society, founded on the *Original Compact*, when it was first offered to the Public, had the Fortune to fall into ill Hands, the Enemies of their Country ; who enforced it, not to defend the Liberties we enjoyed, but to alter the Essence of the Constitution : The Consequence was, that the Authors being justly obnoxious, the Principles were rejected and detested. Afterwards they fell into more moderate Hands : and being then employed to justify the Rights of our limited Monarchy, they were in a little Time generally received, and Men were brought to found their Liberties on those Principles : which Liberties, 'till then, they chose to claim on the precarious Grants of ancient Monarchs, or the illiberal Tenure of more ancient Custom.

With regard to the professed Followers of a Party, too little cannot be said : their best meant Mistakes deserving only Pity, and their worst Calumnies but Contempt.

As to the Enemies of our Establishment, a new kind of Fanaticism has possessed them ; which, as all Fanaticism does, takes its Birth from the Ignorance of human Nature, and the Constitution of Civil Society. One certain Mark of it is their

treating all that differ from them, with the Names of *Hobbeist*, and *Albeist* : And believing, that the few Cant Terms of natural Rights, Civil Liberty, Priestcraft, and Persecution, curiously varied by the Jargon of Logic, will be sufficient to undo what the Wisdom of all Ages and People have concurred to establish.

As to the other Party, who think themselves Friends to our Constitution ; and the more so, by chusing to lie open to the most formidable Attacks, erected on their own Principles, rather than abandon a System of Defense, they have been brought up in ; with these it would be a *Dispute about Taste*. I have given them Corn, and they chuse to stick by their Acorn Husks. *Much good may do them*.

But it is now time to return to our principal Subject. We have given a short Account of the true Nature of the *Alliance between Church and State* ; both to justify the Conduct of the ancient Legislators in establishing Religion, and to shew the infinite Service this Institution is of to Civil Society. Another Advantage in this Digression is the gaining by it an exacter Knowledge of the Nature of the *established Religions in the Pagan World*. For having the true Theory of an Establishment, it serves as a straight Rule, to discover all the Obliquities to which it is applied.

I shall therefore consider the Causes, that, in the ancient World, facilitated the *Establishment of Religion* : And likewise *those* which prevented this Establishment from receiving its due Form ; by which it will be seen, that they did a right Thing a very wrong Way.

I. Ancient *Pagan Religion*, as we have, and shall shew, was the Worship of local tutelary Deities ; which, generally speaking, were supposed to be the Authors of their civil Institutes. The
Consequence

Consequence of this was, that the *State* as well as Particulars, was the *Subject* of Religion. So that it could not but be that this Religion would become national and established; that is, protected and encouraged by the Civil Power. For how could that *Religion*, which was paid to the *national God*, be other than *national*? Or how could that, to which the State, as an artificial Man, was the *Subject*, and paid its Devotions, not be protected by it?

II. But then these very things, which so much promoted an *established Religion*, prevented the Union's receiving a due Form, or being made upon a just and equitable Footing. 1. By giving a wrong Idea of *Civil Society*. 2. By not giving a right Form to the *Religious*.

1. That the Ancients should have a wrong Idea of Civil Society, and believe it ordained for the Cognizance of Religious, as well as Civil Matters, was nothing Strange; while they believed in a local tutelary Deity, by whose Direction they were formed into Society; and that Society, as such, was the Subject of Religion. But we have shewn above, that the Civil Society's offer of a voluntary Alliance with the Religious, upon Conditions, proceeded from its having no power in itself to inforce the Influence of Religion to the Service of the State, which it wanted; and that this Incapacity proceeded from its not having any Jurisdiction in Religious Matters. The Acting then as if it had, would prevent a voluntary Alliance.

2. As to their Religion: If it constituted a proper Society, it was yet of Course a Society dependent on the State; because the State assumed the Cognizance of Religious Matters: It was therefore not *Sovereign*. But, by what has been said above, it appears that no voluntary Alliance can be made, but between two sovereign independent Societies.

But

But in reality, *Pagan* Religion did not constitute any Society at all. For it is to be observed, that the Unity of the Object of Faith, and Conformity to a Formulary of dogmatic Theology, as the Terms of Communion, are the great Foundation and Bond of a Religious Society. Now these the several national Religions of Paganism wanted: in which there was only a Conformity in public Ceremonies. The national *Pagan* Religion therefore did not properly compose a Society; nor do we find throughout all the Writings of Antiquity, that it was ever considered under that Idea; but only as Part of the State; and so indeed, had its particular Societies and Companies: Such as their Colleges of Priests and Augurs.

These were such Errors and Defects as prevented a good deal of the Utility, which results from *Religious Establishments*, placed upon a legitimate Foundation. But yet *Religious Establishments* they were; and notwithstanding all their Imperfections, served for many great Purposes: Such as *preserving the Being of Religion*: — *bestowing additional Veneration on the Person of the Magistrate, and on the Laws of the State*: — *giving the Magistrate the Right of applying the Civil Efficacy of Religion*: — *and giving Religion a coercive Power for the Reformation of Manners*. And thus much for Establishments.

SECT. VI.

THE last Instance we shall assign of the Magistrate's Care for the Support of Religion, shall be that universal Practice in the ancient World of Religious TOLERATION; or the permitting the free Exercise of all Religions, different from the national and established. For though the very Nature and Terms of an established Religion implied the

the Magistrate's peculiar Favour and Protection ; and though in Fact, they had for its Support, their Test Laws, wherever there was diversity of Worship ; yet it was ancient Policy to allow a full and large *Toleration*.

Two Causes principally induced the Legislators to this sage and reasonable Conduct.

I. They considered that Religion seldom or never makes a *real Impression* on the Minds of those, who are forced into a Profession of it. And yet, that all the Service Religion can do to the State, is by working that *real Impression*. They therefore concluded, that the Profession of Religion should be free.

Hence may be seen the strange Blindness of those modern Politicians, who expect to benefit the State by forcing to outward Conformity ; which only making Men Hypocrites and Atheists, destroys the sole Means a Church has of serving the State. But here, by a common Fate of Politicians, they fell from one Blunder to another. For having first, in a tyrannical Humour, or superstitious Fondness for their own Scheme of Worship, infringed upon religious Liberty ; and then beginning to find, that Diversity of Sects was hurtful to the State, as it always will be, while the Rights of Religion are violated ; instead of repairing the Mistake, and restoring Religious Liberty, which would have stifled this pullulating Evil in the Seed, by affording it no farther Nourishment ; they took the other Course, and endeavoured by a thorough Discipline of Conformity, violently to rend it away : And so with it, they unrooted and destroyed all that good to Society, which so naturally springs up from Religion.

II. This was the most legitimate Principle they went upon : Their other, which was the keeping up the Warmth and Vigour of religious Impressions,
by

by the Introduction and Toleration of new Religions and foreign Worship, was more immediate in their Practice. For they considered that (as *Tully* observes in the Words of *Pythagoras*, the most celebrated of *Pagan* Legislators) *then chiefly Piety and Virtue influence the Mind of Man, when he is busied in the Offices of Religion*^a. Now vulgar Paganism being not only false, but highly absurd, having its Foundation solely in the Fancy and the Passions, Variety of Worships was necessary to hit every one's Taste and Humour. The Genius of it making its Followers inconstant, capricious, and fond of Novelties; weary of long worn Ceremonies, and immoderately fond of new Ones. And in effect we see amongst the same People, notwithstanding that universal Notion of tutelary Deities, that, in one Age, one God or Mode of Worship, in another, another had the Vogue. And every new God, or new Ceremony, rekindled the languid Fire of Superstition. Just as in the modern Church of *Rome*, every last Saint gains the Devotees: And on this very Account, as *Diodorus Siculus* expressly tells us, the *Egyptians* brought in and *tolerated* foreign Worship^r.

For here it is to be observed, that in the *Pagan* World, a *tolerated Religion* did not imply Dissension from the *established*, according to our modern Ideas of *Toleration*. Nor indeed could it (as we shall see presently) from the general Nature and Genius of ancient Idolatry. Tolerated Religions were there rather subservient to the *established*, or supernumeraries of it, than in Opposition to it.

^a — Siquidem et illud bene dictum est à *Pythagora*, doctissimo viro, tum maxime et pietatem & religionem versari in animis, cum rebus divinis operam daremus. *De Leg.* l. 2. c. 11.

^r L. 1. *Bib.*

Sometimes indeed, it was otherwise, but generally speaking this was the Case.

But then they were far from being on a Footing with the *established*, or partaking of its Privileges, as hath been in part seen already, and will presently be made more manifest.

But Men, going into Antiquity under the Impressions of modern Ideas, must needs form very inaccurate Judgments of things. So here, few *tolerated Religions* (for some there are) being to be met with in Paganism, according to our Notion of *Toleration*, which is a Religion in opposition to the *national*; and consequently, no one guarded against with that Vigilance that ours are, but all used with more Indulgence, than a Religion, disavowing the established, could pretend to; a false Opinion hath commonly prevailed, that, *in the Pagan World, all kinds of Religion were upon an equal Footing with regard to the State*. Hence we hear our Adversaries perpetually applauding^f wise Antiquity, for the full and free Liberty in Matters of Religion, so agreeable to the Principles of Truth and public Utility: And arraigning the UNSOCIABLE HUMOUR (as they call it) of CHRISTIANITY for the contrary Practice; which, therefore, they would insinuate to be built on contrary Principles.

On this account, it will not be improper to consider a little the Genius of Paganism, as it is opposed to what we call *true Religion*. Which will shew us how easily the Civil Magistrate brought about that *Toleration*, which he had so great Reasons of State to promote: And at the same Time, teach these Objectors to know, that the good Effect of this general *Tolerance*, as far as the Genius of

^f See the *Characteristics*, *passim*.

Religion was concerned in its Promotion, was owing to the egregious Falsehood and Absurdity of Paganism. And that, on the other Hand, the evil Effects of Intolerance, under the *Christian* Religion, proceeded from its Truth and Perfection: Not the natural Consequence, as these Men would insinuate, of a false Principle, but the Abuse of a good one.

Ancient Paganism was an aggregate of several distinct Religions, derived from so many pretended Revelations. These, as they were not laid on the Foundation, so they were not raised on the Destruction of one another. The abounding in Revelations proceeded from the great Number of Gods Men had invented. *The Revelations were not built on one another*; because, having given their Gods, as local tutelary Deities', contrary Natures

* See Book IV. — Nay so extravagant was this Humour of local tutelary Deities, and so fond were they of the Notion, that they degraded even *Jupiter* himself, their *Father of Gods and Men*, into one of these, as appears by his several Appellations of *Jupiter Ammon*, *Olympicus*, *Capitolinus*, &c. Dr. B — seems not to have apprehended this Matter. For in the last Edition of his *Remarks* on that foolish Book called *A Discourse of Free-thinking*; he thus takes up the Translator of *Lucan* for calling *Jupiter Ammon*, *this greatest of the Gods, this mighty Chief*: —
 “ A Roman would never have said that *Jupiter Ammon* was as
 “ great as *Jupiter Capitolinus*; though the Translator took it
 “ for granted *that all Jupiters must needs be the same*. But a
 “ known Passage in *Suetonius* may correct his Notion of the
 “ Heathen Theology. — *Augustus* had built a Temple to
 “ *Jupiter Tonans*, within the Area of the Capitol: whereupon
 “ he had a Dream, that *Capitolinus Jupiter* complained his
 “ Worshipers were drawn away: *Augustus* in his Dream an-
 “ swered, that he had dedicated *Tonans* there, only as the other's
 “ Porter; and accordingly, when he waked, he hung (as a Por-
 “ ter's Badge) that Temple round with Bells. — Now if *Ca-*
 “ *pitlinus* would not bear the very Thunderer by him, but in
 “ Quality of his Porter; much less would he have suffered poor
 “ beggarly *Ammon* (for all he was his Name Sake) to be stiled
 “ the *mighty Chief*. [p. 281.]” This then, it seems, is to tell us
 a Secret.

tures and Dispositions, and distinct and separate Interests, each God set up upon his own Bottom, and held little in common with the rest. *They were not built on the Destruction of one another*; because,
as

a Secret, that in the *Heathen Theology* all Jupiters were not the same: That is, according to the popular Notion: For that only is the Question here; not the Notions of the Philosophers, in their Explanations of the ancient Mythology. These indeed reckon up several different Jupiters: But in the popular Belief Jupiter was but one: The *Father of Gods and Men*. So *Calimachus*, in his Hymn to Jupiter, speaking according to the popular Theology, calls the *Cretans* liars, for pretending to shew the Tomb of Jupiter. How then shall we reconcile the philosophic with the popular Notion, in this Matter? The Case was this: The ancient People sometime, in excess of Flattery, called their good Kings and Benefactors by the Name of Jupiter; as the People of *Lystra* did *Paul*, saying, *the Gods are come down to us in the Likeness of Men*; and afterwards worshiped them as Jupiter; which was one principal Reason of Jupiter's being a tutelary Deity. Now the Philosophers, searching into the Original of the *Pagan Theology*, found that, in several Places, their Kings had give Occasion to the Worship of Jupiter; whom, as a tutelary Deity, being worshiped in each Place by distinguishing and peculiar Rites, they regarded, as several and different Jupiters; considering them as the Kings, in whose Honour these Rites were performed. On the Contrary, the People all the World over considered Jupiter as one, the Father of Gods and Men. All their particular Benefactors, who gave Occasion to his Worship, being swallowed up in him.

But what then shall we do with the Doctor's Story from *Suetonius*; which he brings to prove that, according to the popular Theology, all Jupiters were not the same. But would he persuade us, that the *Romans* did not regard the *Capitoline Jupiter*, and the Thunderer as the same? If he asks, why then had they different Names? *Suetonius* will inform us. Who relates that *Augustus* consecrated this Temple to *Jupiter Tonans*, on his being preserved from a dreadful Flash of Lightning, in his *Cantabrian Expedition*. However, this we must allow, *Capitolinus* and *Tonans* appear to *Augustus* in a Dream, as two different Persons, and are so considered by him, when awake. The true and easy Solution of the Difficulty is this: The *Pagans* always worshiped their Gods under a visible material Shape. And their Statues, when consecrated, were supposed to be informed by an Intelligence, which the God, to whose Worship the Statue was erected,

as has been observed, the several Religions of Paganism did not consist in Matters of Belief, and a dogmatic Theology, in which, where there is a Contrariety, Religions destroy one another: But in Matters of Practice, in Rites and Ceremonies; and in these, a Contrariety did no harm. For having given their Gods contrary Natures and Interests, where was the Wonder that there should be a Discordancy in their Commands? And that *one* should think this no Mark of *another's* false Pretensions?

These were horrible Defects in the very Essence of their Theology. And yet from these would necessarily arise *an universal Toleration*. For admitting each others Pretensions, there must needs be amongst them a perfect Harmony and INTERCOMMUNITY. There being no room for any other Disputes, but whose God was most powerful. Except where, by Accident, it became a Dispute between two States inhabiting the same Country, who was truly the *tutelar* Deity of the Place. As once we are told happened to two *Egyptian* Cities, which broke out into a religious War.

“ Inde furor vulgo, quod numina vicinorum

“ Odit uterque locus, cum SOLOS CREDIT HA-

“ BENDOS

“ Esse Deos, quos ipse colit”.

erected, sent into it as his Vicegerent. This general Notion furnished *Lucian* with a very pleasant Incident in his *Jupiter Tragicus*, who calling a grand Synod of the Gods, is made to summon to it all those of Gold, Silver, Ivory, Stone, and Copper. Now, in *Augustus's* Dream, it was the Intelligence, or Vicegerent in the Statue of *Jupiter Capitolinus*, that complained of his new Brother, in that of *Tonans*, as getting all the Custom from him. This being the whole of the Mystery, *Jupiter's* Identity remains unshaken.

“ *Juvenal*, 15 Satyr.

But

But this Instance stands single in Antiquity; though a certain noble Author would persuade us^w that this was the very Nature and Genius of the *Egyptian* Theology, from whence all Paganism arose. “ The
 “ common Heathen Religion (says he) was sup-
 “ ported chiefly from that sort of Enthusiasm,
 “ which is raised from the external Objects of Gran-
 “ deur, Majesty, and what we call August. On
 “ the other Hand, the *Egyptian* OR SYRIAN Re-
 “ ligions, which lay most in Mystery and conceal-
 “ ed Rites, *having less Dependence on the Magistrate*,
 “ and less of that Decorum of Art, Politeness,
 “ and Magnificence, ran into a more pusillanimous,
 “ frivolous, and mean kind of Superstition: The
 “ Observance of Days, the Forbearance of Meats,
 “ and the Contention about Traditions, Seniority
 “ of Laws, and Priority of Godships.

“ Summus utrimque
 “ Inde furor vulgo, &c.* —

There never was in so few Lines; a more egregious Heap of Blunder and Malignity. Well might he say, he suspected *that it would be urged against him, that he talked at random and without Book^y*: The very contrary of every thing he here says, being the Truth. But his supposing the *Egyptian* Religion *had less Dependence on the Magistrate* than the *Roman*, and that the *Egyptian* and *Syrian*, as he is pleased to call the *Jewish*, were of a like Genius, is such an Instance of his Knowledge and Sincerity, as is not easily equalled. But because he makes such a Buffle with this poor Story of *Juvenal's*; and would insinuate that this was the Original of Intolerance to the *Jewish* and *Christian* World, and was owing to the Spirit and Genius of

^w *Characteristics*, vol. 3. Miscel. 2.

Vol. 3. p. 41.

^y P. 82.

the *Egyptian* Theology; I will shew this Writer's Admirers the true Original of this intolerant Practice in some *Egyptian* Cities, whereby it will appear that their Master was quite mistaken, and in the Dark concerning this whole Matter.

The Instance, as I observed above, stands single in Antiquity. This would incline one to think that no common Cause produced it: And if we enquire into the *Nature* of the *Egyptian* Theology, it will appear impossible to be *that*. For the Notion of local tutelary Deities, which must needs prevent all Intolerance, was originally and peculiarly *Egyptian*, as we shall shew hereafter. It will be then asked how this Mischief happened? I believe I can tell a Passage in *Diodorus Siculus*, as quoted by *Eusebius*, will let us into the whole Mystery; which was this: A certain King of *Egypt* finding some Cities in his Dominions apt to cabal together, and conspire against him; contrived to introduce the Worship of one certain Animal into *each*; different from, and exclusive of every of the *other*: So that while each revered his own, and despised the other's, they would be so indisposed to one another, as never more to unite in a common Design against him. We see then that the Disputes between the *Ombites* and *Tentyrites* in *Juvenal*, were little more a religious War, on the Principles of Intolerance, than a drunken squabble between two trading Companies in the Church of *Rome* about their patron Saints: But the Passage is too remarkable to be omitted. *Diodorus*, when he had delivered what fabulous History records of the Original of Brute-worship, subjoins the true Political one, in these Words: *But some give another Original of the Worship of brute Animals: For the several Cities being formerly prone to Rebellion, and to enter into joint Conspiracies against monarchical Government,*

Government, one of their Kings contrived to introduce into each City the Worship of a different Animal : So that while every one revered that which itself held sacred, and despised what another had consecrated ; they could hardly ever be brought to join cordially together in one common Design, to the Disturbance of the Government^z.

But to return : Such then was the Root and Foundation of this SOCIABILITY of Religion in the ancient World, so much envied by our modern Infidels. The Effect of their Absurdities, as Religions ; and of their Imperfections, as Societies. And yet had universal Custom made this Principle of general Intercommunity, and acknowledgment of one another's Pretensions, so essential to Paganism, that when their Philosophers and Men of Learning, on the spreading of Christianity, were become ashamed of the grossness of Polytheism, and had so refined it by allegorical Interpretations of their Mythology, as to make the several Pagan Deities, but the various Attributes of the one only true God ; yet still they adhered to their darling Principle of *Intercommunity* (for Paganism still continued to be without a dogmatic Theology, or Formulary of Faith) and contended that this Diversity was Harmony, a musical Discord well pleasing to the God of Heaven and Earth. “Æquum est
“ (says *Symmachus*) quicquid omnes colunt unum
“ putari ; eadem spectamus astra ; commune cœ-
“ lum est ; idem nos mundus involvit : *Quid inter-*
“ *est quâ quisque prudentiâ verum requirat ?*” UNO

^z Ἀτίας ὃ καὶ ἄλλας φασὶ τινες τὸ τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων τιμῆς ἔχειν πλεονεξίαν τὸ παλαιὸν ἀφιεργαῖον τῶν βασιλείων, καὶ συμφρονῶντες εἰς τὸ μηκέτι βασιλεύειν, ἐπειθοῦσά τινα ἀφόροτα σεβάσματα αὐτοῖς τῶν ζώων ὑπαρχειν, ὅπως ἐκείνων τὸ μὴ παρ' αὐτοῖς τιμώμενον σεβόμενοι. Ἐν ὧν ὡσαύτως τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀφιεργαῖον καὶ ἀφοροῦσιν, μηδέποτε ἐμνοῦσθαι δύνασθαι πάντες οἱ κατ' Ἀντιόχον. *Euseb. præp. Evang.* p. 32. *Rob. Steph. Ed.*

itinere non potest perveniri ad tam grande secretum^a. The great Lord and Governor of the Universe (says Themistius) seems to be delighted with these Diversities of Religions. It is his Will that the Syrians have one sort of religious Institutions, the Greeks another, and the Egyptians yet another^b. The Reader sees that the Foundation of this Way of thinking, was the old Notion of local tutelary Deities. But what is remarkable, it continues even to this Day, to be the essential Principle of Paganism. Bernier tells us, that the Gentiles of Hindoustan defended their Religion against him, in this Manner: “ Ils me
 “ donnoient cette reponse assez plaisante; qu’ ils
 “ ne pretendoient pas que leur Loi fût universelle
 “ — qu’ ils ne pretendoient point que la nôtre fût
 “ fausse; qu’ il se pouvoit faire qu’ elle fût bonne
 “ pour nous, et que DIEU POUVOIT AVOIR FAIT
 “ PLEUSIEURS CHEMINS DIFFERENS POUR AL-
 “ LER AU CIEL, mais ils ne veulent pas entendre
 “ que la nôtre etant generale pour toute la terre,
 “ la leur ne peut être que fable et que pure inven-
 “ tion^c.” Bernier indeed speaks of this as a peculiar Whimsy that had entered the Head of his Brachman. But had he been as conversant in Antiquity, as he was in modern Philosophy, he would have known that this was a Principle that accompanied Paganism through every Age of it.

Let us now see the Nature and Genius of those Religions which were built, as we say, on true Revelation. The first is the JEWISH; in which was taught the Belief of one God, the Maker and Governor of all things; in contradistinction to all the

^a Lib. 10. Ep. 61.

^b Ταυτη νόμιζε γάνυσθαι τῇ ποικιλίᾳ τῶν πατέρων Ἀργυρίῳ ἄλλως, Σί, ως ἰθέλει ποιεῖσθαι, ἄλλως Ἑλλήνας, ἄλλως Αἰγυπτίους. Orat. XII.

^c *Voyages de Fr. Bernier*, Tom. 2. p. 138.

false Gods of Paganism. Which necessarily introduced a dogmatic Theology. So that the Followers of this Religion, if they believed it true, in the Sense it was delivered to them, must needs believe all others false. But it being instituted only for the *Jewish* People, they had, *directly*, no farther to do with that Falschhood, than to guard themselves from its Infection, by holding no Fellowship or Communion with them.

Yet so strong was this universal Prejudice of *Intercommunity*, that all the Provisions of the Law could not keep these People from running into the Error. For their frequent Defections into Idolatry, till after the *Babylonish* Captivity, was no other than the joining foreign Worship to that of the God of *Israel*. It is a vulgar Error to imagine they consisted in renouncing the Religion delivered to them by *Moses*, as a false one: They all along held it to be true: But deluded by the Prejudice of this *Intercommunity*, they were apt to regard the God of *Israel* only as a local tutelary Deity: This we shall shew at large hereafter^d. And, amongst the several Uses we make of it, one is, to obviate an Objection of the Infidels formed on this popular Error: *That was the Truth of this Religion so strongly evidenced, as Scripture would persuade us, it could not be that the People would so quickly and frequently reject it.*

After this Religion, comes the CHRISTIAN; which taught the Belief of the same one God, the supreme Cause of all Things: And being a Revelation, like the other, from Heaven, must needs be built upon that *other*; or on the Supposition of its Truth. And as this was not designed for one People, but given to all Mankind, for this Reason, but more

^d See Book IV.

especially for others, which will be fully considered in their Place^e, it had a more compleat System of dogmatic Theology. The Consequence of which was, that its Followers must not only think all *Paganism* false, and *Judaism* abolished, and so refuse all Fellowship and Communion with them; but must endeavour to propagate it throughout the World, on the Destruction of all the rest. And their dogmatic Theology teaching them that Truth was the End of Religion, as the *Pagans*, who had only public Rites and Ceremonies, thought public Utility to be^f; it was no Wonder that their Aversion to Falshood should on this Account be vastly increased. And so far all was right. But this Aversion, cherished by Piety, gave Birth to a blind, ungovernable Zeal; which, when Arguments failed to make their due Impression, hurried them on to all the unlawful Licence of Force and Compulsion. Hence the Evils of Persecution, and the Reversement of the Laws of Humanity, in a fond Passion for propagating the Law of God.

This is a true Representation of the State of things, both in the *Pagan*, and in the Believing World. To give it the utmost Evidence, we will next consider the Reception true Religion met with amongst Idolaters.

The *Pagan* World having early imbibed this inveterate Prejudice concerning Intercommunity of Religions, when the Jewish appeared, Men were but too much accustomed to new Revelations, not to acknowledge its superior Pretences. Accordingly we find (as will be made appear hereafter)

^e See *Book* vi.

^f For this the Reader may see *Dion. Hal.*'s Discourse of the Religion which *Romulus* introduced into his Republic; and for the Reason, see *Book* iii. and iv.

by the whole History of that People, that it was esteemed a *true One* by all its Neighbours. And therefore they proceed in their usual Way, on occasion to join it with their own: As did those, whom the King of *Affyria* sent into the Cities of *Israel* in the Place of the ten Tribes. But when these People of God, in necessary Consequence of their having a dogmatic Theology more carefully inculcated to them after their Return from the Captivity, persisted in pretending not only that their Religion was true, but the only true One; then it was, that they began to be treated by their Neighbours, and afterwards by the *Greeks* and *Romans*, with the utmost Hatred and Contempt for this *their Inhumanity and Unsociableness*. To this Cause alone we are to attribute all that Rancour and Spleen that appears, particularly in the iniquitous Accounts the *Roman* Historians deliver concerning them, *Celsus* fairly reveals what lay at the Bottom, and speaks out for them all. — *If the Jews on these Accounts adhere to their own Law, I blame them not: I rather blame those who forsake their own Country Religion to embrace the Jewish. But if these People give themselves Airs of sublimer Wisdom, than the rest of the World, and on that Account refuse all Communion with it, as not equally pure; — I must tell them that it is not to be believed that they are more dear, or agreeable to God, than other Nations^e.*

This was the Reception the *Jews* met with in the *Pagan World*: but not pretending to obtrude their Religion on the rest of Mankind, as being

Εἰ μὲν δὴ καὶ ταῦτα περὶ ἑαυτοὺς Ἰουδαῖοι τὸ ἴδιον νόμον, ἢ μεμπ-
τὰ αὐτῶν· ἐκείνων δὲ μᾶλλον τὸ κακὸν καὶ τὸ σφύριον, καὶ τὰ ἁ-
δαιῶν ποταμῶν. εἰ δ' ὥς τί ποτέ τις· εἰδότες σεμνύνειν τι,
καὶ τ' ἄλλων κοινωνίαν οὐκ ἐξ ἴσου καθαρώς διακρίνοντες — ἢ μὲν
ἐν δ' ἀδουκίᾳ πρὸς τῷ θεῷ καὶ σέβεται ἀπεφύκει· τί τ' ἄλλων
τύτῃς ἐκός. Orig. cont. Celsum, l. 3. p. 259.

given solely to them, they yet escaped Persecution.

When *Christianity* arose, though on the Foundation of *Judaism*, it was at first received with great Complaisancy by the *Pagan* World. For they were such utter Strangers to the Idea of one Religion's being built, or dependent on another, that it was a long while before they knew this Connexion between them. Even *Celsus* himself, with all his sufficiency, saw so little how this Matter stood, that he was not satisfied whether the *Jews* and *Christians* worshiped the same God: was sometimes inclined to think they did not. This Ignorance, which the Propagaters of our Religion were not too forward in enlightening^b, for fear of hindering the Progress of the Gospel, prevented the Prejudice they had to *Judaism*, from indisposing them to Christianity. So that the Gospel was favourably heard; and the superior Evidence, with which it was accompanied, disposed Men, habituated to pretended Revelations, eagerly to receive it. Accordingly we find one *Roman* Emperor introducing it amongst his Closet Religions:

^b To this old *Pagan* Blindness some Moderns, who would be thought *Christians*, but tired with what they call the dead weight of *Judaism*, seem to have succeeded. These Men pretend that what is said in Scripture of the Dependency and Foundation of Christianity on Judaism, is said by Way of *Accommodation* to the Prejudices of the *Jews*; but that when the Preachers of the Gospel applied themselves to the *Gentiles*, they preached up *Jesus* simply, as a divine Messenger from God; pretermittting the *Jewish* Characters of him. Now, though nothing can be more false, or, for any who ever read the *Epistles* of *St. Paul*, more extravagant; yet the Manner of their introducing themselves to the *Gentiles*, furnished that little Shadow of Pretence for saying so: *The Reason of which wise Conduct we have given above.* But when the *Gentiles* had embraced Baptism, then all Care was taken, as we may see by *St. Paul's Epistles*, to let them into the true Nature of Christianity, by instructing them in its Dependency on Judaism: But more of this hereafter.

And

And another proposing to the Senate, to give it a more public Entertainmentⁱ. But when it was found to carry its Pretension higher; and to claim, as the *Jewish* did, the Title of the only true one, then it incurred all that Hatred and Contempt, under which the *Jewish* had so long laboured. But when it went still farther, and pretended a Necessity for all Mankind to forsake their Country Religions, and embrace it; this so shocked the *Pagans*, that it soon brought upon itself the bloodiest Storms of Persecution. This was truly the Beginning of Persecution for Religion (though not the Original of the intolerant Principle, as we shall see before we come to the End of this Section) a Persecution not committed, but undergone by the Christian Church.

This Account of Matters shews how it happened, that such good Emperors as *Trajan*, and *M. Antonine*, came to be found in the first Rank of Persecutors. A Difficulty that has very much em-

ⁱ The not attending to the Genius of ancient Paganism, hath betrayed some of the best modern Critics into an iniquitous Judgment on the first ancient Apologists; who, they pretend, have unskilfully managed, in employing all their Pains to evince what was so easy to be done, namely, the Falseness of Paganism, rather than in proving the Truth of their own Religion. For, say these Critics, was Paganism proved false, it did not follow that Christianity was true; but was the *Christian* Religion proved true, it was Demonstration that the *Pagan* was false. But now we see the Apologists acted with much good Sense and Judgment: For the Matter was just otherwise. The Truth of Christianity was acknowledged by the *Pagans*: They only wanted the *Christians* in their turn to acknowledge theirs to be true likewise. As this could not be done, there was a Necessity to give the Reasons of their Refusal. And this gave birth to so many Confutations of Idolatrous Worship. It is true, when their Adversaries found them persist in their *unsociable* Pretences, they returned the Treatment in kind; and accused Christianity in its turn, of Falseness: But this was not till afterwards, and then faintly, and only by Way of acquit.

barraressed

barrasted the Enquirers into Ecclesiastical Antiquity; and given a Handle to the Deists, who empoison every Thing they touch, of pretending to suspect that there must be something very much amiss in primitive Christianity, while such good Magistrates could become its Persecutors. But now the Reason stands manifest: the Christian Pretences overthrowing a fundamental Principle of Paganism, which they thought founded in Nature; namely, *the friendly Intercommunity of Worship*. And thus we come to the true Sense of that famous Passage of *Pliny the Younger*: “*Neque enim dubitabam, qualecunque esset quod fateretur, certe, pervicaciam & inflexibilem obstinationem debere puniri*.”^k For what was this *inflexible Obstinacy*? It could not be in professing a new Religion: That was a thing common enough. It was the refusing all Communion with Paganism: refusing to throw a Bit of Incense on their Altars. For we must not think, as is commonly imagined, that this was enforced by the Magistrate to make them renounce their Religion; but only to give a Test of the *Hospitality and Sociableness* of it. It was indeed, and rightly, understood by the *Christians* to be a renouncing their Religion: and so, accordingly, abstained from^l.

Thus

^k Lib. 10. Ep. 97.

^l After this one sees little Reason for Mr. *Whiston's* Amazement at these Words of *Pliny* to *Trajan*. *Amazing Doctrine!* (says he, in his 7th Prelim. Differ. to his *Josephus*) that a firm and fixed Resolution of keeping a good Conscience, should be thought without Dispute, to deserve Death; and this by such comparatively excellent Heathens (he would say Moralists, both because the Thing in Question regarded them under that Character, and the Word comparatively required that Term) as *Pliny* and *Trajan*, p. 129. For they did not consider this Inflexibility as an Error, but as an Immorality. The unsociable, uncommunicable Temper, in Matter of religious Worship, was esteemed by the best Pagans

Thus we have shewn our Adversaries the true Original of that universal Tolerance, as far as Religion influenced it, under Paganism; and the Want of it sometimes under Christianity. The Account will be further useful to many great Purposes as will be seen hereafter. At present we shall only hint at one specious Objection against Christianity, which it obviates. If it was, say the Deists, accompanied with such illustrious and extraordinary Marks of Truth, as is pretended; how happened it, that its Truth was not seen by more of the best and wisest of those Times? And if it was seen (as it certainly was by *Ammianus Marcellinus*, *Macrobius*, and many others) how could they continue *Pagans*? The Answer is plain and strong. The Truth was generally seen. But we have shewn, that the Conviction of the Truth of a new Re-

as a Hatred and Aversion to Mankind: As Mr. *Whiston* might have seen by a Passage he himself has quoted from *Tacitus*, p. 127. *Igitur primo correpti [Christiani] qui fatebantur; deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens; haud perinde in crimine incendiis quam ODIUM HUMANI GENERIS CONVICTI SUNT. Convicted*, he says, of hate to all Mankind. But how? The Heathens Confession of the Purity of the *Christians* Morals, shews this could be only a Conviction of their rejecting all *Intercommunity* of Worship; which, so great was this Prejudice, they thought could proceed from nothing but *hate to Mankind*. The very same Character *Tacitus* gives of the *Jews*: *Apud ipsos FIDES OBSTINATA*, sed aduersus omnes alios HOSTILE ODIUM. Now the *Jews* and *Christians* had nothing in common, but this unfociable uncommunicable Temper in religious Matters: This *obstinata fides*, which gave so much Umbrage to Paganism. They knew all the Merit of a firm and fixed Resolution of keeping a good Conscience, as appears from the famous *Iustum & tenacem propositi virum*, &c. But, unluckily for Truth, they did not see the *Pervicacia & inflexibilis obstinatio* of the *Christians* in that Light. — But the good Old Man; by the Train of his Reflexions hereabouts, appears, as usual, rather to be possessed with his own imaginary Case, than that of the primitive *Christians* in the Time of *Trajan*.

ligion

ligion was, with Men over-run with so universal a Prejudice, no Reason for their quitting their old one.

The Case indeed was different in a *Jew*, who held none of this Intercommunity. If such a one owned the Truth of Christianity, he must needs embrace it. We certainly therefore conclude, that the Passage where *Josephus*, who was as much a *Jew* as the Religion of *Moses* could make him, is made to acknowledge that *Jesus is the Christ*, in as strong Terms as Words could do it, is a rank Forgery, and a very stupid one too.

We have now explained the Motives the Civil Magistrate had to *tolerate*: — Of what Nature that *Toleration* was: — And how easily it was brought about.

But then, lest the People should abuse this Right of worshiping according to their own Will, which the Magistrate supported for the Benefit of the State, to its Detriment, by Means of private and clandestine Conventicles; he always took Care that such Worship had the public Approbation and Recognition, before it was received on the Footing of a *tolerated Religion*.

So by the Laws of *ATHENS*, no *strange God*, or *foreign Worship* was allowed of, till approved and licensed by the Court of *AREOPAGUS*. This was the Reason why *St. Paul*, who was regarded as the Bringer in of *foreign Gods*, *ΞΕΝΩΝ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ*, was had up thither. Not as a Criminal, but a public Benefactor, who had a *new Worship* to propose to a People, *above all others, religious*, *ὨΣ ΔΕΙΣΙΔΑΙΜΟΝΕΣΤΕΡΟΙ*. *Tully*^m makes *Solon* the Founder of this Court. But *Plutarch* in his *Life*

^m *De Officiis*, lib. I. c. 22.

of that Legislatorⁿ, quotes a Law of his, which makes mention of the *Areopagus*, as before existing. The Difficulty is to reconcile these two Accounts. I imagine this to be the Case: *Solon*, we know, was employed by the *Athenians* to new model their Commonwealth, by reforming the ill Constitutions, and supplying the defective Ones. So that in the Number of his Regulations, I presume, this was one: The adding to the Court of *Areopagus* the peculiar Jurisdiction in Question; as of great Moment to public Utility. And having thus enlarged and enobled its Jurisdiction, he was afterwards regarded as the Founder of it. A Passage in *Æschylus* seems at first Sight not to favour this Opinion; but to insinuate, that the Jurisdiction in Question was coeval with the Court. For, in the fifth Act of his *Eumenides*, he makes the Worship of the *Furies*, or the venerable Goddesses, as they were called, to be received and recognized in *Athens*, by a Decree of *Minerva*, as Head of the College of *Areopagus*, which the Poet feigns she had just then instituted. But this plainly appears to have been contrived only for the Sake of a poetical Embellishment. And *Æschylus* seems to employ one Circumstance in this Scene, designedly to inform us of the Order of Time, in which the Court received its two different Jurisdictions. It is, where he makes the criminal Cause of *Orestes*, the first that was judged at this Tribunal; and the Religious One, of the Reception of the *Eumenides*, but the Second. However this be, the *Areopagus* was, by far, the most tremendous Judicature in the Republic. And it struck my Observation, that *Aristophanes*, who spares neither the Fleets, the Armies, the Courts

* *Vitæ parall.* vol. I. p. 198. Edit. Bryan.

of Justice, the Person of the Supreme Magistrate, the Assemblies of the People, or the Temples of the Gods themselves, does not dare to lance one single trait against this venerable Body.

The ROMANS had a Law to the same Purpose ; which, as oft as it was violated, was publicly vindicated by the Authority of the State : as appears from the Words of *Posthumius* in *Livy*, quoted in the last Section. *Quoties hoc patrum avorumque ætate negotium est magistratibus datum, ut sacra externa fieri vetarent, sacrificulos vatesque foro, circo, urbe prohiberent, vaticinos libros conquirerent* °? &c. Which shews their Care to have all tolerated Religions under the Magistrate's Inspection. And, if I am not much mistaken, *Tully*, in his *Books of Laws*, the Substance of which is taken from the *Twelve Tables*, gives us that very Law ; whereby, as we said, all foreign and clandestine Worship, unauthorized by the Civil Magistrate, was forbid. SEPERATIM NEMO HABESSIT DEOS : NEVE NOVOS, NEVE ADVENAS, NISI PUBLICE ADSCITOS, PRIVATIM COLUNTO P.

No

° *Lib. 39. Hist.*

P *Lib. 2. c. 8.* Thus I think the Words ought to be read and pointed. The common Reading is, *seperatim nemo habessit Deos neve novos : sed ne advenas, nisi publicè adscitos, privatim colunto* : which is quite absurd and unintelligible. The Manuscript quoted by *Manutius*, reads *neve novos sive advenas*. In a word, this Law, for want of rightly apprehending the Nature of Paganism, and of their tolerated and established Religions, has never been understood by the Critics : Nor does the Comment that follows, give any Light to it. What hath been said above on these Points, will enable us to come to a very easy Meaning of it. By the first Branch, *seperatim nemo habessit Deos*, is meant, that the Gods in general should not be worshiped in private Conventicles, or be had as it were in Propriety (*suos Deos* says the Comment) in a different Manner than the People commonly worshiped. And by the second Branch, *neve novos, neve advenas, nisi publicè adscitos, privatim colunto*, is meant that PARTICULARS should not worship any new or foreign God without Licence and Authority

ity

No Man shall worship the Gods clandestinely, or have them separately to himself: Nor shall any new or foreign God be worshiped by Particulars, 'till such God hath been legally approved of, and tolerated by the Magistrate. Why, I say, this appears to me to have been the very Roman Law of Toleration itself, is because Tully in his Comment on it says, that had this Law been observed in Rome, the State of Religion there had been in a different Condition from what it was. Which Comment, as concise, and consequently as obscure as the Text, follows in these Words: SUOSQUE DEOS, AUT NOVOS, AUT ALIENIGENAS COLI, CONFUSIONEM HABET RELIGIONUM, ET IGNOTAS CEREMONIAS: NON A SACERDOTIBUS, NON A PATRIBUS ACCEPTOS DEOS, ITA PLACERET COLI, SI HUIC LEGI PARUERANT IPSI⁹. For each Man to have his Gods in
pecu-

rity from the State. For we must remember what hath been said in the first Section of this Book concerning the two Parts of Pagan Religion; the one public, and the other private: the one, which had the State for its Subject; the other, *Particulars*. Now the *State*, as such, worshiped only the Country Gods: and this was properly the *established Religion*. The *Particulars*, as such, frequently grew fond of new and foreign Gods, and Modes of Worship: and these, when recognized by the State, were their *tolerated Religions*. *Privatim* therefore signifies [by *Particulars*] not [privately] which latter Sense would make a Contradiction in the Sentence: *Nisi publicè adscitos, privatim colunto*: Let them not worship them PRIVATELY, unless they be PUBLICLY recognized. For how could those be said to be privately worshiped, that were publicly owned? By *Deos novos*, both here and in the Comment, I suppose, is meant, Gods newly become such: For the *Dii minorum gentium* were a kind of every-day Manufacture; such as Tully in the Words immediately following thus describes: Ollos quos endo cælo merita vocaverint; or, those who had newly discovered themselves to Men. And by *Advenas*, the known local Gods of other Countries.

⁹ Lib. 2. c. 10. Thus I venture to correct the Passage. The common Editions have it, — Non a sacerdotibus, non a patribus acceptos Deos,

peculiar, or to worship new or Stranger Gods, without public Allowance, tends to confound all Religion, and introduce clandestine Worship: And had the Priests and our Forefathers had a due Regard to this Law,
we

Deos, ita PLACET coli, si huic Legi PARUERUNT ipsi. Gruter says, "Ita me Deus amet, vix intelligo: hæreo, adhuc hæreo." And none of the Critics have pretended to make Sense of it, but *Petit* in his Comment on the *Attic Laws*. "De advenis Diis (says he) "sibi facit objici *Tullius*, an non liceat acceptos a Sacerdotibus "aut a Patribus alienigenas Deos colere? Respondet *Cicero*, licere, "si, prout hac cavebatur lege, publice sint adsciti, non privatim "patrum aut sacerdotum auctoritate. Hic igitur verborum *Tullii* "sensus est, qui latet & lectores fugit, quia excidit interrogatio- "nis nota, loco suo restituenda & reponenda ad hunc modum: "Sæpius Deos, aut novos aut alienigenas coli, confusionem habet re- "ligionum, & ignotas ceremonias. Non a Sacerdotibus, non a Patri- "bus accepti Deos? Ita placet coli, si huic Legi PARUERINT ipsi." But as plausible as this appears at first, it cannot be the true Interpretation. For, 1. *Tully* is made to object impertinently: for who, from the Words, *neve novos, neve advenas, nisi publicè adscitos, privatim colunto*, could form any Suspicion that by this Law the Gods received by the Priests or their Forefathers, or by any else, were forbid to be worshiped, were they but publicly recognized? and those, which were not so, were prohibited, from whatever Quarter they were brought in. 2. This Interpretation will not agree with the Cast and Design of the Work. *Tully* speaking of it, says, *Non enim populo Romano, sed omnibus bonis firmisque populis leges damus*. Now this Objection, relating to the City of *Rome* only, was altogether impertinent and from the Purpose.— That the Sense I give to it is the true, appears from hence: 1. That the Observation was highly proper, being of the Nature of an Example to a Precept. He delivers a Law concerning the licensing new Religions by the Magistrate; and then takes notice, that, had it been well observed in *Rome*, it had prevented a great deal of Superstition. All here is natural and just. 2. The frequent Breach of this Law was a very notorious and remarkable Fact in *Rome*; as we may see by the Speech of *Posthumius* in *Livy*, quoted above; and therefore very likely, in this Place, to have been taken notice of by *Tully*. I will only observe farther, that as the general Sense of the Law justifies my Emendation in the Comment; so the Words, *aut novos aut alienigenas*, in the Comment, confirm my Correction in the Law. — By *confusionem religionum* I suppose *Tully* to mean, such a Confusion of Worship,

we should never have approved of that kind of Worship which we now pay to the Gods they introduced amongst us.

But notwithstanding all this, Mr. Bayle, from the Words above quoted from the Speech of *Posthumius* in *Livy*, would persuade us^r, that the *Romans* did not admit or tolerate foreign Worship; and that the Care of the Magistrate, there taken notice of by the Consul, was to prohibit all Religions, but the *established*: An Opinion which the whole *Roman* History disproves: where we find with what Facility the Magistrate, from Time to Time, tolerated all foreign Religions. The Care then *Posthumius* meant was surely that of preventing all clandestine Worship, unlicensed by the Magistrate: which appears even from that other Passage Mr. B. brings from *Livy* to support his Assertion: “*Nec corpora modò affecta tabo, sed animos quoque multiplex Religio & pleraque ex-*

as would leave no Distinction between the established and tolerated Religions: and thereby reduce Religion in general to so impotent a State, as to be no longer serviceable to Civil Society: And by *ignotas ceremonias*, Ceremonies, which the Magistrate, by reason of their Celebration in private Conventicles, could not take any Account or Cognizance of: which might therefore be of great Prejudice to Society, by the Perpetration of all Kinds of Immoralities, such as happened, on this very account, in the *Bacchanals* at *Rome*; or foster Cabals of Faction, which might be hatched and hid in clandestine Meetings of Religion. In the remaining Words, the Author gives a plain Hint, that had this Law been observed, many great Incommodities of Superstition in the then established and tolerated Religions had been avoided; which he intimates plainly enough, their ignorant Forefathers and interested Priests had introduced, without Warrant from the State. To conclude, the Neglect of this Law in *Rome* was, as we observed, very notorious: and I make no question but it was chiefly owing to their not having a standing Judicature for that purpose, as at *Athens*.

^r *Pens. div. c. 221.*

“ terna invasit, novos ritus sacrificando, vaticinan-
 “ doque *inferentibus in domos, quibus quaestui sunt*
 “ *capti superstitione animi*’.” But more particu-
 larly from the very *Affair Posthumius* was here en-
 gaged in. At the Time this Speech was made,
 the State was above measure exasperated by the
 monstrous Enormities committed in the clandestine
 Rites of *Bacchus*: Yet it is most remarkable, that,
 in the Edict passed in the very Height of their Re-
 sentment, the Right of Toleration is preserved in-
 violable: — “ *Ne qua (says the S. C.) Bacchanalia*
 “ *Romæ, neve in Italia essent. Si quis tale sacrum*
 “ *solenne & necessarium duceret, nec sine religione*
 “ *& piaculo se id omittere posse apud Prætorem*
 “ *urbanum profiteretur; Prætor Senatû consule-*
 “ *ret, si ei permissum esset, quum in Senatu cen-*
 “ *tum non minus essent, ita id sacrum faceret, dum*
 “ *ne plus quinque sacrificio interessent; neu qua*
 “ *pecunia communis, neu quis magister sacrorum,*
 “ *aut sacerdos esset*’.” *Dionysius Halicarnassæus*, that
 diligent Enquirer into the *Roman* Constitution,
 plainly distinguishes between their *established* and
tolerated Religions. The Passage is remarkable;
 and will not only serve to overthrow Mr. B.’s No-
 tion, but to furnish us with an Opportunity of ex-
 plaining what is farther wanting for a full Intelli-
 gence of this Matter. His Words are these: —
 “ And this, above all Things, raised my Admira-
 “ tion, that, notwithstanding the vast Multitudes
 “ that throng from all Parts to *Rome*, who must
 “ there, consequently, worship their own Gods,
 “ according to their own Country Rites; yet the
 “ City never adopted into the PUBLIC Religion
 “ any of these foreign Worship; as is the Custom

’ *Lib. 4. Hist.*

’ *Lib. 39*

“ for many other States to do.” Whence it appears, 1. That all Strangers might freely worship in *Rome* according to their own Way: and that, what *Particulars* of the State were so disposed, might join with them: and that, besides these *tolerated* Religions, there was one *public established* one, that admitted no foreign Mixtures. 2. We are not to understand the Author as if his Wonder was caused by the *Romans* having an *established* Religion *distinct* from the *tolerated* ones; but, that they mixed, or introduced into the *established* few or no foreign Rites; which was very customary in the Cities of *Greece*: for those are the *other States*, which the Historian hints at. But modern Writers not penetrating into this Matter; where they saw the *Roman* Practice of admitting into their *public* Religion no foreign Worship, concluded wrongly that they allowed no *Toleration*: and where they saw the *Greek* Practice of naturalizing foreign Religions, by adopting them into their *public* Worship, as wrongly, that they had no *Establishments*. 3. The Words Ἡ ΠΟΛΙΣ ΔΗΜΟΣΙΑ, are remarkable: He does not say the City did not admit of foreign Worship, but, that it did not admit of it PUBLICLY; that is, bring it into the *public* Religion of the State. For, as we observed before, Paganism had two Parts, one public, and the other private: the *State*, as such, was the Subject of the one; and *Particulars*, as such, of the other. But they admitted it *privately*; that is, allowed *Particulars* to use foreign Rites, after the Magistrate’s Licence had been obtained for that

“ Καὶ ὁ πάντων μάλιστα ἔγνω τεθαύμακα, καίπερ μυρίων ὄσων εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπεληλυθότων ἰθῶν, οἷς ποσσὴ ἀνάγκη σέβειν τὰς παλαιὰς θεὰς τοῖς οἰκοθεν νομίμοις, εὐδενὸς εἰς ζῆλον ἐλήλυθε ἧ ξενικῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἢ πόλις δημοσία, ὃ πολλαῖς ἤδη σωσίῃ παθεῖν. *Antiqu. lib. 2.*

Purpose. So that the *established* Religion, every where, related to the *public* Part of Paganism; and the *tolerated* to the *private* Part. 4. The Historian observes, that, in this Conduct, *Rome* differed from many other Cities, meaning the *Grecian*. And indeed it was less a Wonder than he seems to make it: For *Rome*, rising on its own Foundation, independent of, and unrelated to any other State, and early possessed with the high Fanaticism of Distinction and Empire, it would esteem its tutelary Gods more peculiarly and incommunicably appropriated to itself; and therefore reject all foreign Mixtures. On the contrary, the *Grecian* States, related to, and dependent on one another, would more easily admit of an Association and Combination amongst their tutelary Deities.

Such was the Nature of TOLERATION in the Pagan World; and this the wise Provision of Ancient Policy, while Civil Liberty kept its own. But when now Society began to degenerate, and *all* preposterously to submit to the Will of *one*; when the Magistrate came to have a Good distinct from that of the People; and Civil Peace was estimated, not by the Blessings it produced, but by the Degree of Subjection it imposed; then the fashionable System of Politics began to turn solely on the Maintenance of a Tyrant's Power: And he having observed, that, though the *Toleration* of Religion, under the Regulations above described, was evidently for the Advantage of Society; yet, as those Regulations were too apt, even in the best Times (as we have seen above) to be neglected, he thought it most expedient to cut off all Occasions and Opportunities of Mischief to himself from private Conventicles and Conventions, by a thorough *Uniformity* of Religion, and an absolute *Intolerance* of all foreign Worship.

Agree-

Agreeably to this Scheme of Policy, we find *Mæcenas*, in *Dion Cassius*^w, dissuading *Augustus* from allowing any *Toleration* of Religion whatsoever: an Indulgence in this respect indisposing Men to the Government, and to the Civil and Religious Constitutions of their Country: which would give Birth to Cabals and Confederacies against the State: And concludes his Advice against *Toleration* in these remarkable Words, 'ΑΠΕΡ'ΗΚΙΣΤΑ ΜΟΝΑΡΧΙΑ ΣΥΜΦΕΡΕΙ; as a Thing by no Means agreeing with Arbitrary Power. And we find by *Suetonius*^x, that the Usurper followed it. Thus we see the famous Declaration of, *one King and one Religion*, is no new Maxim of modern Policy.

So noble an Origin had the Principle of *Intolerance*. How iniquitous then are the Adversaries of our holy Religion, to throw it upon *that*; when it plainly appears to have been the Offspring of Civil Tyranny; how well soever it may have been afterwards nursed by some Fathers of the Church.

Thus have I attempted to give a clear Account of the general Methods used by ancient Policy to inculcate and support Religion. Was I to speak, as I once intended, of those which particular Lawgivers and Magistrates employed for the distinct Use of their own peculiar Societies, the Truth we endeavour here to prove, would be greatly illustrated: But this, though the most curious Part of this Enquiry, must, by reason of its disproportioned Length, be omitted to some fitter Opportunity. In the mean time, I presume, more than enough has been given, even in those Parts that only manifest the Legislator's Care for Religion in general, to prove the Truth of our Proposition,

^w *Lib. Hist.* 52.

^x *Vit. Aug.* c. 93.

That in the Opinion of ancient Policy, the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments was indispensably useful to Civil Society. For having proved that the Doctrine of a future State was an inseparable Part of Pagan Religion, and the sole Support of it, the proving their Care for Religion in general, proves their Care for this Doctrine in particular. Where it is worth observing, that, though the ancient Legislators erred from Truth, and differed from one another, even in the most momentous Points, concerning Propriety, Marriage, Dominion. &c. yet they all unanimously agreed in owning the Use, and propagating the Belief of a future State of Rewards and Punishments: than which, a stronger Proof of its Necessity cannot, we presume, be given.

B O O K III.

S E C T. I.

IN the Beginning of the last Book, I entred upon the Proof of my second Proposition; namely, THAT ALL ANTIQUITY WAS UNANIMOUS IN THINKING THAT THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS WAS NECESSARY TO THE WELL BEING OF SOCIETY: And the Method I laid down for proving it was, 1. From *the Conduct of Legislators, and the Founders of Civil Policy.* 2. From *the Opinions of the wisest and most learned of the ancient Sages.*

The Conduct of the Legislators hath been fully examined in the last Book.

II. THE OPINION OF THE ANCIENT SAGES concerning this Matter, is the Subject of the *present*,

They too, as well as the Legislators, were unanimous on this Point, how discordant soever and at Variance amongst themselves, in all other Matters. Whatsoever Train of Politics the Historian followed, whatsoever System of Nature the Philosopher espoused; *this* always remained an unquestioned Principle. The Favourer of Arbitrary Power esteemed it the strongest Bond of blind Obedience; and the Vindicator of Civil Liberty, the largest Source of Virtue and a public Spirit. The Philosophic Atheist, from the Vastness of its Use to Society, would conclude Religion to be but the

Invention of Statesmen; and the Theist, from that acknowledged Utility, laboured to prove it of divine Original.

But to give the Reader a *Particular* of those Passages, where this Truth is owned and contended for, would be to transcribe all Antiquity: For with this, every thing they teach and tell of Morals, Politics, human Nature, and human Actions, begins and ends. I shall therefore content myself with two or three Passages, as a Specimen only of the universal Voice of ancient Wisdom. *Timæus* the *Locrian*, a very early *Pythagorean*, well practised in Affairs, and, in *Plato's* Opinion, of consummate Knowledge in Philosophy, discoursing on the Remedies to moral Evil, after having spoke of the Use of Philosophy to lead well framed Minds to Happiness, by teaching the Measures of just and unjust adds, that for intractable Spirits Civil Society was invented: which keeps Men in awe by the Coercions of Law and Religion: “But
“ if we come to a perverse ungovernable Disposition, then Punishments should be applied; both
“ those which Civil Laws inflict, and those which
“ the Terrors of Religion denounce against the
“ Wicked from above and from below: as, that
“ endless Punishments await the Shades of unhappy Men; and all those Torments, which I commend the *Ionic* Poet for recording from ancient
“ Tradition, in order to cleanse the Mind from
“ Vice^a”.

The sage Historian, *Polybius*, whose Knowledge of Mankind and Civil Society was so consummate,

^a ——— ‘Εἰ δὲ καὶ τις Σκληρὸς καὶ ἀπειθὴς, τῆτω δ’ ἐπιδῶ κόλασις, ἢ τ’ ἐκ τῶν νόμων καὶ ἢ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σωτῆρα ἐπαγεύουσα δεινὰ τε ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ καὶ τὰ καθ’ ἑαυτὴν, ὅτι κόλασις ἀπαραίτητος διπλὴν ἔσται· δαίμονι νεκρῶν καὶ τοῖς ὅσα ἐπαινεῖ τ’ ἰσχυρὸν ποιῆται, ἐκ παλαιᾶς ποιουνῶ τῶς ἐπαγίας. Περὶ ψυχῆς κόσμου.

that *Rome* preferred him to the august Employment of composing Laws for *Greece*, now become a Province to that Republic, speaking of the Excellence of the *Roman* Constitution, expresses himself in this Manner. “ But the superior Excellency
 “ of this Policy, above others, manifests itself,
 “ in my Opinion, chiefly in the religious Notions
 “ the *Romans* hold concerning the Gods: That
 “ Thing, which in other Places is turned to Abuse,
 “ being the very Support of the *Roman* Affairs:
 “ I mean Superstition; which is come to such a
 “ Height, both in its Influence on Particulars,
 “ and on the Public, that nothing can exceed.
 “ This, which many may think extraordinary, to
 “ me seems plainly to have been contrived for the
 “ sake of the Community. If indeed one was to
 “ frame a Civil Policy only for wise Men, ’tis
 “ possible this kind of Institution might not be
 “ necessary. But since the Multitude is ever fickle
 “ and capricious, full of irregular Passions, and
 “ irrational and violent Resentments, there is no
 “ way left to keep them in order but by the Ter-
 “ rors of future Punishment, and the pompous
 “ Circumstance that belongs to such kind of Fi-
 “ ctions. On which account the Ancients acted,
 “ in my Opinion, with great Judgment and Pe-
 “ netration, when they contrived to bring in these
 “ Notions of the Gods, and of a future State in-
 “ to the popular Belief; and the present Age as
 “ absurdly and inconsiderately, in removing them,
 “ and encouraging the Multitude to despise their
 “ Terror. For see now the Difference: In *Greece*,
 “ he that is entrusted with the public Money (to
 “ pass by other Matters) though it be but of a
 “ single Talent, and though he gives a Ten-fold
 “ Security before twice the Number of Witnesses,
 “ cannot be brought to discharge his Engagements;
 “ while

“ while, amongst the *Romans*, the mere Religion
 “ of an Oath keeps those, who in the public
 “ Administration, or in foreign Legations, have
 “ vast Sums of Money pass through their Hands,
 “ from violating their Honour and Integrity. And
 “ whereas, in other Places, it is rare to find a Man
 “ who can keep his Hands clean, or forbear plun-
 “ dering the Public; on the contrary, it is as rare,
 “ amongst the *Romans*, to take any one offending
 “ in this Kind. That every Thing that exists is
 “ subject to Mutation and Decay, we need not be
 “ told; the Nature of Things sufficiently in-
 “ forms us of it. But there being two Ways, by
 “ which every kind of Policy is brought to Dissol-
 “ ution; the one from without, and the other
 “ from within; that Destruction, which comes from
 “ without, cannot be certainly warded by any hu-
 “ man Provision: But then, there are sure and ea-
 “ sy Remedies for that which rises from within.”

This

Ἰ — Καί μοι δοκεῖ τὸ ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις δειδιζόμενον, τὸ τοῦ σπινέχου τὰ Ρωμαίων περιγυμναζέμεν, λέγω ὅτι τὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν. ἐπεὶ τοσούτον γὰρ ἐκτελεσθέντων, καὶ παρεστῆκεν τὸ τοῦ μετὰ παρ’ αὐτοῖς εἰς τε τῆς κατ’ ἰδίαν βίης καὶ τὰ κοινὰ τὴν πόλεως, ὥστε μὴ καταλιπεῖν ὑπερβολὴν, ὃ καὶ δόξειεν αὐτοῖς καὶ θαυμάσιον. ἐμοὶ γὰρ μὴ δοκεῖσι τῶν πλήθους χάριν τὰ τοῦ σπινέχου ποιεῖν. εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἦν σοφῶν ἀδελφῶν πολί-
 τῶμα σπινέχου, ἴσως ἔδεν ἦν ἀναγκαῖον ὁ τοιαῦτα τὰ πράττειν. ἐπεὶ ὅτι πάντων πλήθος, ἐστὶ ἐλαφρόν, καὶ πολλὰς ἐπιθυμιῶν ἀφαιρούμενον, ἀργῆς αἰσίου, θυμῷ βίαιος, λείπει τῶν ἀδελφῶν φρόνους, καὶ τῇ τοιαύτῃ τρα-
 γῶδι τὰ πλήθη σπινέχου. διόπερ οἱ πολλοὶ δοκεῖσι μοι τὰς περὶ θεῶν ἐκείνων, καὶ τὰς περὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀφελήσεις, ἐκείνη καὶ ὡς ἐτιχεν εἰς τὰ πλήθη παρεισαγαγεῖν. πολὺν δὲ μάλλον οἱ νῦν εἰρήνῃ καὶ ἀλόγως ἐκβάλλουσι αὐτά. τοιγαρὶν χωρεῖ τὸ ἄλλων, οἱ τὰ κοινὰ χειρίζοντες, ᾧ καὶ μὴ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, ἰὰν τὰ λανθάνοντες ἐκείνων ἀντιγραφῆς ἐχούσι δικαίαν, καὶ σφραγίδας τοσαύτας, καὶ μάστιγας διπλάσιαις, ἐδιδόκουν τῇ τῆς πόλεως. ᾧ καὶ Ρωμαῖοις κατὰ τε τὰ δέχα, καὶ παρεστῆκας πολὺν τι πολλὸν χρημάτων χειρίζοντες δι’ αὐτῆς τῆς καὶ τὸ ὅρκοις πίστεως, τηρεῖσι τὸ καθήκον. καὶ ᾧ καὶ μὴ τοῖς ἄλλοις σπινέχου ἐστὶν ἀπεχόμενον ἀνδρῶν τῶν δημοσίων, καὶ καταρδύοντες περὶ ταῦτα. ᾧ καὶ τοῖς Ρωμαῖοις σπινέχου ἐστὶ τὸ λαβεῖν τινα περὶ φαρακμῶν ἐπὶ τοιαύτῃ πράξει. ὅτι μὴ ἐν παντί τοῖς ἑσιν ὑπόκεινται φθορὰ καὶ μεταβολή, χεῖρον δὲ προσδοκῶ λόγον.

ἰκανῶς

This long Passage deserves our most serious Attention, and that for many Reasons. *Polybius* was a *Greek*, and, as all good Men are, a tender Lover of his Country, whose ancient Glory and Virtue were then fast on the Decline, and the *Roman* mounting to its Meridian. The melancholy Reflections, arising from this View, were always uppermost in his Thoughts: so here, speaking of the great influence Religion had on the Minds of the *Romans*, he could not forbear giving a Lesson to his Countrymen; and instructing them in what he esteemed the principal Cause of their approaching Ruin; namely a certain Libertinism, that had spread amongst the *People of Condition* (who piqued themselves on a Knowledge superior to their Ancestors and the People) of regarding themselves, and preposterously teaching others to regard the Restraints of Religion as visionary and superstitious. He proves this by shewing the strong Influence it has on the Morals of Mankind. — But to understand what follows, of the two Ways by which a State comes to Ruin, from without and from within, which seems to be brought in abruptly, and to have no relation to the Subject in hand; we must suppose; that those, to whom the Historian addresses himself, had objected, *That it was not the Want of Piety, but the Roman Arms, that had broken the Grecian Power; and that this they were to submit to, because all Empires have their slated Periods.* Suppose this, and then the political Reflection of the Fall of States, will have a high Propriety, and close Connection with what preceded; and is to

ἰκανὴ γὰρ ἡ τῆ φύσεως ἀνάγκη ἀφαιρῆσαι τὴν τοιαύτην πίστιν. διὸν δὲ
 τούτων ὄντων καὶ ἡ φθίρεα πείσκει πᾶν γένος πολιτείας, ἥ μὲν
 ἔξωθεν, ἥ δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς φυσικῶς· τὸ μὲν ἑκάτερον ἔχειν συμβαίνει τὴν
 θεωρίαν· τὰ δ' ἐξ αὐτῶν, τελευτήν. *E Polyb. Historiarum lib. 6.*

C. 54, 55.

this

this Effect : I agree with you, says *Polybius* to the Objectors, that Evils, coming to a State from without, cannot easily be provided against ; but those arising from within, may. Now I take our Misfortunes to have proceeded from *these* : for had not a Want of Religion depraved the Manners of the *Greek Nation*, the *Romans* would have had neither Pretence nor Inclination to invade us ; and therefore your trite Aphorism of the *Mutability of human Things* has here no Place.

But had this great Man lived but one Age later, he would have seen large Occasion of addressing the same Admonition to the *Romans* themselves ; when that very Spirit forerun and contributed to the Destruction of their Liberties : and Religion had so lost its Hold of those, whom, in the Time of *Polybius*, it had entirely possessed, that *Cæsar* could dare, in full Senate, with a Degree of Licence unparalleled in Antiquity, to declare, that the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments was all a groundless Cheat. This was a dreadful Prognostic of *Rome's* approaching Ruin.

If *Polybius* may be believed, though *Paul* may not, it would not then surely be amiss for our *People of Condition* to look about them, and compute their Gains by such a Conduct : those of them I mean, if any such there be, who profess to love their Country, and yet as publicly despise the Religion of it. One of them, who did both in a very eminent Degree, and who would substitute a TASTE instead of a *future State* for the Government of the World, thus expresses himself : — “ Even Conscience, I fear, such as is owing to religious Discipline, will make but a slight Figure, where this TASTE is set amiss : Amongst the Vulgar perhaps it may do Wonders : a Devil and a Hell may prevail, where a Jail and a Gallows are
“ thought

“ thought insufficient. But such is the Nature of
 “ the liberal, polished, and refined Part of Man-
 “ kind ; so far are they from the *mere Simplicity of*
 “ *Babes and Sucklings*, that instead of applying the
 “ Notion of a future Reward or Punishment to
 “ their immediate Behaviour in Society, they are
 “ apt much rather, through the whole Course of
 “ their Lives, to shew evidently that they look on
 “ the pious Narrations to be indeed no better than
 “ Children’s Tales and the Amusement of the mere
 “ Vulgar”. I will not now ask where was the
Religion, but where was the *Civil Prudence* of this
 great Patriot ? For if it be indeed true, as he con-
 fesses, that *a Devil and a Hell may prevail where a*
Galley and a Gallows are thought insufficient ; why
 would this *Lover of his Country* take off so necessary
 a Restraint on the Manners of the Multitude ?
 If he says he would not ; I ask, Why then has he
 publicly ridiculed it ? Or was it indeed his Inten-
 tion to make all his Fellow-citizens MEN OF
 TASTE ? He might as well have thought of mak-
 ing them all *Lords*.

So absurd, so pernicious is the Conduct of our
 Free-thinkers, admitting them to be in the right.
 But if instead of rooting up Superstition, they be
 indeed (and I question not before I have done with
 them, to prove it to the Satisfaction of all Man-
 kind) blaspheming true Religion, and, what is
 more, one extraordinarily revealed by God, what
 Name must we give to this Degree of Madness
 and Impiety ?

On the whole, I fear we are in no right Way :
 Whether in the Public too we resemble the Pi-
 cture this sage Historian hath drawn of degener-

rating *Greece*, I leave to such as are better skilled in those Matters to determine.

The Great *Geographer*, whose Knowledge of Men and Manners was as extensive as the habitable Globe, speaks to the same Purpose: “ The Multitude in Society are allured to Virtue by those enticing Fables, which the Poets tell of the illustrious Atchievements of ancient Heroes: such as the Labours of *Hercules* or *Theseus*; and the Rewards conferred by the Gods for Well-doing. So again, they are restrained from Vice by the Punishments these are said to inflict upon Offenders; and by those Terrors and Threatnings, which certain dreadful Words and monstrous Forms imprint upon their Minds: or by believing that divine Judgments have overtaken evil Men. For it is impossible to govern Women and the common People, and to keep them pious, holy, and virtuous, by the Precepts of Philosophy: This can be only done by Superstition; which is raised and supported by ancient Fictions and modern Prodigies: Therefore the Fables of the Thunder of *Jupiter*, the *Ægis* of *Minerva*, the Trident of *Neptune*, the Thyrsus of *Bacchus*, and the Snakes and Torches of the *Furies*, with all the other Apparatus of ancient Theology, were the Engines which the Le-

^d Strabo's Words are — Καὶ φόβος, καὶ ἀπειλὰς, ἢ ἀπὸ λόγων, ἢ ἀπὸ τύπων αἰῶν, *Fears and Threatnings by Words or dreadful Forms*. *Casaubon*, who corrected the last Word very justly, has given us no Explanation of the Allusion in this obscure Sentence. I am fully persuaded the Author had in his Mind the dreadful Words spoken, and the Representations exhibited in the *Mysteries*, for the very purpose the Author here mentions: So ἀπειλὰς refers to λόγων, and φόβος to τύπων αἰῶν. The Reader who remembers what has been said in the Section of the *Mysteries*, in the foregoing Book, concerning this Matter, will be inclined to believe this to be the true Explanation of the Passage.

“ gillator

“giffator employed, as Bugbears, to strike a Terror in the childish Imaginations of the Multitude.”

Lastly, *Pliny* the Elder, though an Epicurean, owns it to be necessary to Society, that Men should believe the Gods concerned themselves in human Affairs; and that the Punishments they inflict on Offenders, though sometimes late in deed, as from Governors busied in the Administration of so vast an Universe, yet are never to be evaded^e. Thus he, though an Epicurean; but an Epicurean in his Senses. From whom we hear nothing like the mad Strains of *Lucretius*, that all Religion should be abolished, as an Enemy to the Peace of Mankind.

SECT. II.

BUT to give this matter the utmost Evidence, we will set together the *public Teaching*, and *private Sentiments* of the ancient Theistical Philosophers, on the Point in Question. When it will be seen, that though they were perpetually incul-

^e “Οἱ τε πολλοὶ τῶν πόλεως οἰκόντων εἰς μὴ προλεσπῶν ἀγνοοῦσι τοῖς ἡδέσι τῶν μύθων, ὅταν ἀκέωσι τῶν ποιητῶν ἀνδραγαθήματα μυθῶν διηγεμένων· οἷον Ἡρακλῆος ἀθλῶς, ἢ Οἰσεύος, ἢ τιμαῖς ᾧδῶν τῶν θεῶν νεμερῶν, — εἰς ἀπολεσπῶν ᾗ, ὅταν κολάσεις ᾧδῶν θεῶν, καὶ φόβος, ἔπειλας, ἢ ἀφ’ ὧν λόγων, ἢ ἀφ’ ὧν τύπων αἰσίων τινῶν προσδέχωνται, ἢ καὶ πιστεύουσι ᾧδῶν περὶ τινος. Οὐ γὰρ ὅχλόν τε γυναικῶν, καὶ πάντος χυδαῖα πλῆθος ἐπαγαγεῖν λόγῳ δυνατόν φιλοσόφῳ, καὶ προσηλασθῆναι πρὸς ἀπισθεῖαν, καὶ ὁσιότητα, καὶ πίστιν, ἀλλὰ οὐ καὶ ἀφ’ ὧν δαιμονίας τῶν δ’ ὅσα ἀνδρῶν μυθοποιίας, καὶ τερατείας. Κεραυνὸς γὰρ, αἰγὴ, καὶ τεύχεα, καὶ λαμπάδες, καὶ δράκοντες, καὶ θυρεόλοφα τῶν θεῶν ὅπλα, μῦθοι καὶ πᾶσα θεολογία ἀρχαῖα καὶ ταῦτα δ’ ἀπίσταντο οἱ τὰς πολιτείας καταστητάριοι μορμολύκαες τινὰς πρὸς τὰς ἐπιπόρνας. *Strabo. Geogr.* -l. 1.

^f Verum in his Deos agere curam rerum humanarum credi, ex usu vitæ est: pœnasque maleficiis aliquando feras, occupato Deo in tanta mole, nunquam autem irritas esse. *Hist. Nat.* l. 2. c. 7.

cating

cating to the People the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments in their Discourses and Writings, yet they were all the while Philosophising in private on other Principles. Which Conduct, sure, could be owing to nothing, but their really regarding the *Doctrine*, as the very Vitality of Religion; and the only Support of that Influence, which it has on the Minds of the Multitude; as they so frequently profess to think.

Now, though after having read their History, considered their Characters, and examined their Writings with all the Exactness I was able, it appeared evident to me, that these Men believed nothing of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, which they most industriously propagated in Society; yet the Contrary having been so long and so generally taken for granted; and *their* Opinions so often urged by our ablest Writers, as conformable and favourable to the Christian Doctrine of a future State; I suspect that what I have here said, will be esteemed, at first Sight, an unreasonable and licentious Paradox.

Notwithstanding this, I hope to prove my Point in the strongest and most unexceptionable Manner. And as it is of great Moment to shew the Sense Antiquity had of the Use and Necessity of the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments to Society; and as in shewing *that*, I shall be enabled to clear up a very important Point in Antiquity, long involved in the Obscurity of Contradictions; I shall have my Reader's Pardon for the Length of the Enquiry.

But to take off what I can from the general Prejudice, I shall, before I enter on the Matter, explain what is meant by that *future State*, which, I suppose, the Theistical Philosophers did not believe. And this the rather, because the contrary Opinion
has

has long continued unquestioned, through the lax ambiguous Use of the Term. Thus, because it was evident that all, or most of the Theistical Philosophers believed, as well as taught the *Immortality*, or rather the *Eternity* of the *Soul*, Men familiar only with the Association of modern Ideas, concluded that they believed, as well as taught, the Doctrine of a *future State of Rewards and Punishments*.

To make the Reader then Master of the Question, it will be proper just to distinguish the several Senses, in which the Ancients conceived the Permanency of the human Soul; and to reserve their Explanation, and Assignment to their distinct Authors, for another Place.

This *Permanency* was either,

- I. *A simple Existence after this Life : Or,*
- II. *Existence in a State of Reward and Punishment, according to Men's Behaviour here.*

Each of these was two-fold.

Simple Existence was either,

I. AN IMMEDIATE REFUSION OF THE SOUL ON DEATH INTO THE UNIVERSAL NATURE, OR TO 'EN, FROM WHENCE IT PROCEEDED :

Or, II. A CONTINUANCE OF ITS SEPARATE AND DISTINCT EXISTENCE ON DEATH, FOR A CERTAIN PERIOD, BEFORE ITS REFUSION INTO THE TO 'EN, IN A SUCCESSIVE TRANSITION THROUGH VARIOUS ANIMALS, BY A NATURAL AND FATAL, NOT MORAL DESIGNATION.

The *State of Rewards and Punishments* was either,

- I. A STATE OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, *IMPROPERLY* SO CALLED; WHERE

X

HAPPI-

HAPPINESS AND MISERY WERE THE NATURAL AND NECESSARY CONSEQUENCE OF VIRTUE AND VICE; NOT POSITIVELY SO, OR BY THE ARBITRARY DESIGNATION OF WILL:

Or, II. A STATE OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, *PROPERLY* SO CALLED; WHERE THE HAPPINESS AND MISERY CONSEQUENT ON VIRTUE AND VICE, WERE THE POSITIVE AND FREE DESIGNATION OF WILL, AND NOT THE NECESSARY CONSEQUENCE OF THINGS.

This last is that Notion of a future State, which we have endeavoured to shew, is so useful to Society; which all the Legislators, Sages, Priests, and Philosophers publicly taught and propagated; and which the People throughout the whole Earth universally believed: Of which the METEMPSYCHOSIS was an inseparable Part; and, what is more, continues to be so to this very day, as appears from the belief of the civilized *Gentiles* of the East.

It is A FUTURE STATE then OF REWARDS and PUNISHMENTS in general, that I undertake to prove none of the ancient Philosophers believed; and particularly the second and proper Notion of it. For as to the *first*, it was peculiar to the public Teaching of the *Platonists*.

But before I proceed to the Exposition of the Principles of each Sect, it will not be improper to premise those *general Reasons*, which induced me to think that the Philosophers did not always believe what they taught, and that they taught this Doctrine without believing it. Whereby the Reader's Surprise and Prejudice may be so much abated, as to attend fairly to the Proofs that are to follow.

follow. And as the chief Prejudice against my Opinion ariseth from the Philosophers having so much talked and wrote in Behalf of a future State of Rewards and Punishments; the three first of the following general Reasons will shew, 1. That they all thought it allowable to say one thing, and think another. 2. That they perpetually practised what they thus professed to be lawful. And 3. That they practised it with regard to the very Doctrine in Question.

I. My *first* general Reason was, *that the ancient Sages held it allowable, for the public good, to say one thing when they thought another.*

We have described the Times of Antiquity very ill, if it does not appear from what has been said above, that each People had the most religious Regard to the Laws and Constitutions of their Country. What raised this Veneration (which is natural to all Men, accustomed to a Form of Policy) to so great a Height, was apparently, the popular Prejudice in favour of their pretended Originals. For, as hath been shewn above, their Founders all pretended to have received their several Civil Institutions from some *patron God*. At the same Time, with the Civil Policy, was the national Religion established; where the principal Worship's being paid to the *patron God*, gave Cause for inventing that *public Part* of Religion, which we have explained above: By which, the State, as such, became the Subject of religious Worship.

This of Course, making the national Religion to be esteemed one of the most necessary and essential Parts of the Civil Policy, we are not to wonder that it should become an universal Maxim, embraced not only by mere Politicians, but by all the best and wisest of those Times, THAT EVERY

ONE SHOULD CONFORM TO THE RELIGION OF HIS COUNTRY. And how possessed Men were with the Reasonableness and Importance of it, may be seen from the Conduct of the great SOCRATES himself. Now he sure, if any, was most likely to detect the Folly of this general Prejudice; who made it his whole Business to search out, and expose all Errors that related to human Life. Yet when he comes upon his Defense before his Judges; a Defense, in which he was so strictly regardful of Truth and Honour, that, when his Friends proposed to him several Modes of urging it, of confessed Efficacy for his acquittal, he rejected them all, because not so exactly conformable to the rectitude of his Ways; when he comes, I say, in his Defense to that part of the Accusation, which delates him of attempting to overturn the popular Divinities, he declares it in the most solemn Manner, as his Opinion, that *every one should adhere to the Religion of his Country*. But if it should still be suspected, that he only here said what made best for his Defense, let us pursue him to his last Moments, retired amidst his philosophic Friends and Followers; and there we shall find him still true to this great Principle, in a Circumstance, which hath much puzzled modern Writers to account for; I mean the Request to his Friends, of sacrificing a Cock to *Æsculapius*: A piece of Devotion, on some account or other due from him, according to the Customs of his Country, which he had neglected to perform.

But now for all this, no one I believe, the least conversant in Antiquity, will take it into his Head that these Sages, because they held *every one should adhere to the Religion of his Country*, did not therefore see the gross Errors of the national Religions: All their Writings being full of the Absurdities of them.

them. But then it will be asked, why they should not think it lawful and reasonable to forsake Error, and embrace the Truth; especially when these very Sages spent all their Time and Studies, to persuade Mankind of the Importance of this Conduct in general, to their Happiness?

The plain Explanation of the Riddle is this: The Genius of their national Religions taught them to conclude, THAT UTILITY AND NOT TRUTH WAS THE END OF RELIGION. And if we attentively consider *that Genius*, as occasionally explained in the several Parts of this Work, which was formed entirely subservient to the State, we shall not much wonder at their Conclusion.

And now not rightly distinguishing between *particular* and *general* UTILITY, between that which arises from the *illegitimate* Administration of Civil Policy, and the *legitimate*, they universally embraced this other false Conclusion, THAT UTILITY AND TRUTH DO NOT COINCIDE.

From this Principle, a third necessarily arose, THAT IT WAS LAWFUL AND EXPEDIENT TO DECEIVE FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD. This all the ancient Philosophers were full of: And *Tully*, from *Plato*, thinks it so clear, that he calls the doing otherwise NEFAS. The famous *Scævola* the *Roman Pontif*, declares frankly his Opinion, as *St. Austin* tells us, *that Cities should be deceived in Religion*^s. The last mentioned Author goes on and says, “*Varro de religionibus loquens, evidenter dicit, multa esse VERA, quæ vulgo scire non sit UTILE; multaque, quæ, tametsi falsa sint, aliter existimare populum expediât.*” Upon which the *Father* Remarks, *Hic certe totum consilium prodidit SAPIENTIUM, per quos civitates & populi regerentur.* As we go along, we

^s Expedire existimat falli in religione civitates. *De Civit. Dei* l. 4. c. 10.

shall find *this Principle* universally owned, and practised by the Theistical Philosophers. And *Macrobius*, informing us on what Subjects the Philosophers used this License of *lying for the public good*, says it was concerning the SOUL and the *national Gods*: “Sciendum est tamen, non in omnem disputationem philosophos admittere *fabulosa* vel LICITA; sed his uti solent, cum vel de ANIMA, vel de aëreis æthereisve potestatibus, vel de ceteris Dis loquuntur^h.”

II. My *second* general Reason was, *that the ancient Sages did actually say one thing when they thought another*. This appears from that general Practice in the *Greek Philosophy*, of a TWO-FOLD DOCTRINE. The EXTERNAL and the INTERNAL. A vulgar and a secret One. The first openly taught to all; and the second confined to a select Number. Nor were they different Points of Doctrine, but one and the same that were handled thus differently; popularly and philosophicallyⁱ. In which the Philosophers were as cautious how they revealed their arcane Opinions, as were the Teachers of the Mysteries; and set about it with the same Solemnity^k. And as the right Apprehension of the Nature of the *double Doctrine* was the true Key to the ancient *Greek Philosophy*, several in the later Ages wrote Discourses *on the hidden Doctrines of the Philosophers*^l.

^h In *Som. Scip.* l. i. c. 2.

ⁱ Duplex enim erat doctrinæ genus apud antiquas gentes, δημῶδες καὶ ἀπὸρρητόν, doctrina vulgaris & doctrina arcana; idque non tantum ob diversitatem materiæ, sed eandem sæpe materiæ duplici modo tractabant, populari & philosophica. *Archæol. Phil.* l. i. c. 8.

^k And in the same Form of Words,

Ἀλέγξομαι οἷς διμῶδες ἐστὶν, διὰ τοῦτο ὅτι ἐν ταῖς θεοῖς βιβλίοις.

So *Porphyrus* in *Eusebius* introduces his internal Doctrines.

^l *Zacynthus* scripsit τὰ ἀπὸρρητὰ καὶ φιλοσοφικά referente *Laetio*. *Porphyrus* τὰ φιλοσοφικά τὰ ἀπὸρρητὰ, teste *Eunapeo* in ejus vita.

But

But as these, which would have given us much Light, are all lost, we must be content to grope out our Way to the Original and End of the *double Doctrine*, as well as we are able.

For it is not enough for us, that this Method of Teaching was general amongst the *Greek Philosophers*. To bring it to our Point, we must prove it to have been invented for the *good of Society*: And the rather, because the Original is little understood: It being generally supposed that the End was less legitimate than we make it: Either a barbarous Delight which the Inventers had in Mystery and Obscurity; or a tricking Littleness of Mind. *Toland*, who made it the Business of a wretched Life, to shed his Malignity on every thing that was great and venerable, sometimes^m supposes it the Issue of Craft and Roguery; at other times, a grave and wise Provision against the Outrage of Bigots, and the superstitious Vulgar. And an infinitely different Sort of Man, the celebrated *Fontenelle*, when he calls Mystery, which is the Consequence of the double Doctrine, *the Apanage of Barbarity*, seems to be as widely mistaken. I shall shew first, that those, from whom the *Greeks* borrowed this Method of philosophising, invented it for the Service of Society. And Secondly, that these who borrowed it, employed it for that Purpose; however it might at length degenerate into Craft and Folly.

1. That all the Wisdom and Learning of the *Greeks* was brought or fetched immediately from *Egypt*, is so unanimously acknowledged by themselves, that it is the best established Fact in Antiquity. Now *Herodotus*, *Diodorus Siculus*, *Strabo*, *Plutarch*, and indeed who not? all testify that

^m In a thing he calls *Of the Exoteric and Esoteric Philosophy*. See his *Tetradymus*.

the *Egyptian* Priests, with whom the Learning of the Place resided, had a two-fold Philosophy, the one hidden and sacred, the other open and vulgar.

To know their End in this Method of teaching, we must consider their Character. *Ælian* tells usⁿ, that in the most early Times, the *Priests*, amongst the *Egyptians*, were *Judges* and *Magistrates*. The Care of the People then must needs be their chief Concern, under both Characters. And as well what they divulged, as what they concealed, must be altogether for the sake of Society. Accordingly we find them to have been the first who taught Intercourse with the Gods, a future State of Rewards and Punishments, and Initiation into Mysteries, instituted for the Support of that Belief: The *Δοκίμῃα* of which were the Doctrines of the Unity.

But to give this Truth the utmost Evidence, namely that it was for the sake of the State, that the method of the *double Doctrine* was invented, we shall produce the Testimonies of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *Plutarch*: who both tell us, that it was chiefly to their Kings and Magistrates, to whom the secret Doctrines of the College were revealed. *The Egyptians* (says *Clemens*) *did not use to reveal their Mysteries indiscriminately to all; nor expose their sacred Truths to the Profane; but to those only who were to succeed to the Administration of the State: and to such of the Priests as were most approved by their Education, Learning, and Quality*. “The
“Kings were chose (says *Plutarch*) either out of
“the Priesthood, or the Soldiery, This Order for

ⁿ *Var. Hist.* l. 14. c. 34.

“*Λιγύπριοι δ' τοῖς ἐπιτέχασιν τὰ ὡσαύτως ἀντιθεῖστο μυστήρια, οἳ μὲν βροχίοντες τὴν ἑ δέων εἶδον. ἐξέφραγον, ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν γε τοῖς μελλόντι ἐπὶ τῇ βασιλείᾳ πορεύεσθαι καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τοῖς καθήκοντι ἐν ἐκκαθάρσει διὰ τε τὴν τροφὴν καὶ τὴν παιδείαν καὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν.* *Strom.* l. 5. p. 566. *Ed. Luc.*

“ their

“ their Valour, and *that* for their Wisdom, were had
 “ in Honour and Reverence. But when one was
 “ chose out of the Soldiery, he was forthwith had
 “ to the College of the Priests, and instructed in
 “ their secret Philosophy; which involves many
 “ things in Fables and Allegories, where the Face
 “ of Truth is clouded and obscured^p.”

And in the same Manner, and with the same View, the *Magi* of *Persia*, the *Druids* of *Gaul*, and the *Brachmans* of *India*, the Genuine Offspring of the *Egyptian* Priests, and who like them shared the Administration of the State, had all their external and internal Doctrines^q.

What hath misled both ancient and modern Writers to think the *double Doctrine* to be only a barbarous and selfish Art of keeping up the Reputation of the Teacher, was a prevailing Opinion, that moral and natural Truths were concealed under the ancient Fables of the Gods and Heroes. For then, these Fables must have been invented by the ancient Sages; and invented for the sake of explaining them, and nothing more. So the learned Master of the Charter-house, taking it for granted that the Sages were the Inventors of the ancient Mythology, concludes that one of these two things was the Original of the double Doctrine: — “ Sive id
 “ factum fuerit pro ingenio priscorum hominum,
 “ maxime orientalium; sive utea, quæ pulchra erant,
 “ difficilia redderent, neque primo intuitu discernen-
 “ da^r.” But that sure is an idle Hypothesis of the later *Greek* Philosophers. The old *Pagan* My-

Ἡ οὖν βασιλεὺς ἀπεδείκνυτο μὲν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὸ μαχίμω, ἔ-
 μ δὲ ἀνδρείαν, ἔ δὲ ἀφ' αὐτῆς σοφίαν, γῆρας ἀξίωμα καὶ τιμὴν ἔχοντα·
 ὁ δὲ ἐν μαχίμῳ ἀποδείκνυτο, αὐτὸς ἐγίνετο τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ αὐτὸς
 τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ ἐπικεκρυμμένης τὰ ποικίλα μύθοις καὶ λόγοις ἀμείβε-
 σάμενος τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ ἀμφάσεις ἔχεσθαι. *De Is. Et Os.*

^q Orig. cont. Celsum, l. 1.

^r Archæol. Phil. c. 3. l. 1.

thology was indeed only the Corruption of ancient historical Tradition ; and consequently arose from the People ; whose Follies and Prejudices gave birth to the double Doctrine, to be employed for their Service. But what it was that facilitated its Use, we shall see hereafter, when we come in the fourth Book, to speak of the Original of the *Egyptian Hieroglyphics*.

2. We are now to shew that the *Greeks*, who borrowed this Method of the *double Doctrine*, employed it to the same Purpose with the *Egyptians*, who invented it.

1. The first who went out of *Greece* to learn the *Egyptian* Wisdom, were the LEGISLATORS: Or such as, projecting to reduce the scattered Tribes, which then over-ran *Greece*, into Civil Society, travelled thither to learn the Art of Law-giving, from a People the most celebrated of all others for that Science. These, as *Orpheus*, *Rhadamanthus*, *Minos*, *Lycaon*, *Triptolemus*, and others, busied themselves with no other of the *Egyptian* Wisdom, than this only : but received the *double Doctrine* along with it ; as appears from their instituting the *Mysteries*, where it was practised, in their several Civil Establishments.

2. The next sort of Men who went thence to *Egypt* for Knowledge (though the Intercourse of the Law-givers with *Egypt* was not interrupted, but continued down to the Times of *Draco*, *Lycurgus*, and *Solon*) were the NATURALISTS ; who both at the Beginning, and the End of their Period, bore the name of *Sophists*. For now *Greece* being advanced from a savage barbarous State, to one of Civil Policy, the Consequence of which was the Cultivation of the Arts of Life ; the Inhabitants began to speculate. But *Physicks* and *Mathematics* were all the Employment of their early *Sophists*,
such

such as *Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Xenophanes, Parmenides, Leucippus, and Pherecydes Syrus*. For which these two Reasons may be assigned: 1. As these Studies, all along, appeared to be best fitted to the refined, curious, inquisitive Temper of that People, this Post, as of greatest Honour, would be first seized. 2. *Greece* was at that time over-run with petty Tyrants, the Descendents of their ancient Heroes, which made it unsafe to turn their Speculations on Morals, in which Politics were so eminently contained, and made so principal a Part. For *Thucydides* tells us[†], *that when now the Power of Greece was enlarged (that is on their coming out of a State of Barbarity) and their Revenues by their love of Wealth much increased, in most of the Cities Tyrannies were erected.* All then that these learnt of the *Egyptians*, was physical and mathematical Knowledge: And as in the Cultivation of these there was little Occasion for, so their Characters of mere Naturalists made them have less regard to the *double Doctrine*. And in effect, we find little mention of it amongst the first *Greek Sophists*, who busied themselves only in these Enquiries.

3. The last sort of People, that went to *Egypt* for Instruction, were the PHILOSOPHERS, properly so called. A Character exactly compounded of the two preceding, the *Law-giver* and the *Naturalist*. For when now the *Grecian* States had in Process of Time recovered their Liberties, Morals and *Politics* would become the Subject in fashion. From this time the *Greek Sophists* were violently given to Legislation, and became actually employed to make Laws for the several emerging popular Governments. On which account it was, that *Aristotle*

[†] L. 1. *Hist.*

observed,

observed, *the best Legislators in ancient Greece, were amongst the middle Rank of Men.* The first (as well as most famous) of this Class, who gave it its Name and Character, was *Pythagoras*. He, and *Plato*, and Numbers more, travelled into *Egypt* like their Predecessors. But now having joined in one the two different Studies of Legislation and Philosophy, a slight Tincture of *Egyptian* Instruction would not serve their Purpose; to compleat their Character, there was a Necessity of being thoroughly imbued with their most recondite Wisdom. Accordingly we are told by the Ancients^{*} of their long abode in *Egypt*, their hard Conditions of Admittance into the sacred College, and their bringing away with them all the secret Wisdom of their Priests. The Result of all was, and it is very remarkable, from this time the *Greek Sophists*, now called *Philosophers*, began to cultivate at the very same Time, *the Belief of a future State of Rewards and Punishments*, and *the Practice of the double Doctrine*; which *two Principles* were the distinguishing Badges of their Character.

Thus, by an intimate Acquaintance with the *Egyptian* Priesthood, the *Greeks* at length, got amongst themselves a new Species of Sages, whose Character much resembled that of their Masters. But with this Difference, that amongst the *Egyptian* Priests, and so amongst the *Magi*, the *Brachmans*, and the *Druids*, Philosophy was but an Appendix to Legislation; while amongst the *Greeks*, Legislation was the Appendix to Philosophy. For Philosophy was the first Acquest and Study of the *Greek* Sages, and Legislation of the *Egyptian*. There was yet another Difference; which was, that in the

^{*} *Porph. de vita Pythag.* — *Strabo de Platone*, l. 17. *Geogr.*
— *Osgen. Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.* c. 3.

Greek Philosopher, the two Characters of Legislator and Philosopher were always kept distinct, and conducted on contrary Maxims; whereas in the *Egyptian Priest*, they were one and undistinguished. So that in *Greece*, the *hidden Doctrines* of the *Mysteries*, and the *Σοφίσματα* of the *Schools*, though sometimes founded by one and the same Person, as by *Pythagoras*, were two very different things; but in *Egypt*, one and the same.

Greece was now well settled in popular Communities; and yet this legislating Humour still continued in her Philosophers. And when they had no more Work, they still kept on the Trade; and from practical, became speculative Law-givers. This gave birth to a Deluge of visionary Republics, as we may see by *Diogenes Laertius*; where in the several Catalogues of their Works, one is always as sure to find a Treatise *de Legibus*, or *de Republica*, as one *de Deo*, *de Animâ*, or *de Mundo*.

But of all the Sects, the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonists* continued longest in this Humour. The *Academic* and *Stoic*, indulging to the disputatious Genius of the *Greek Philosophy*, struck out into a new Road; and began to cultivate the last great Branch of Philosophy, *Logic*, especially the *Stoics*, who, from their great Fondness to it, were surnamed *Dialectici*.

The Reader has here a short View of the Progress of the *Greek Philosophy*: which *Plato* aptly divided into *PHYSICS*, *MORALS*, and *LOGIC*^u. We have shewn the Order of their birth: The Study of *Physics* began, while *Greece* groaned under its petty Tyrants: *Morals*, public and private, arose with their Civil Liberties: And *Logic*, when they

^u Μέγη δὲ Φιλοσοφίας τεῖλα, ΦΥΣΙΚΟΝ, ΉΘΙΚΟΝ, ΔΙΑΛΕΚΤΙΚΟΝ. *Diog. Laer. Proem.* § 18.

had contracted a Habit of Disputation and Refinement.

But when now the Liberties of *Greece* began to be again shaken by Tyrants of greater Name and Power; and all the Posts of Honour were occupied and possessed by the Sects above mentioned, some ambitious Men amongst them, as *Epicurus*, returned back into the Original, old fashioned Road of *Physics*; rejecting all *Politics*, *Legislation*, and *Logic*; and accordingly (which deserves our Notice) with *them*, rejected the Use of the *double Doctrine*^w, as of no Service in their Reform. This evidently shews it to have been employed for the sake of Society. For was it as *Toland* would pretend, *for their own*, it could never be employed more properly than in *Physics*; because the celestial Bodies being amongst the popular Gods, physical Enquiries concerning their Nature, could hardly escape the public Odium: Notwithstanding this, both the *first* Philosophers, and these *last*, who dealt only in *Physics*, equally rejected the *double Doctrine*. On the other Hand, the legislating Philosophers, who dealt much in Nature too, employed *this Doctrine* in these very Enquiries: as is evident from what is said of *Pythagoras* concerning Earthquakes. Who told the People that they were occasioned by the assembling a Synod of Ghosts under Ground*. But *Jamblicus*^y informs us, that he sometimes predicted Earthquakes by tasting of Well-water^z.

It

^w *Clemens Alex.* indeed, *Strom.* 5. says that the *Epicureans* bragged they had their Secrets, which it was not lawful to divulge; but this was plainly only arrogating to themselves a Mark of Philosophy, that those, to whom it really belonged, had made venerable.

* *Ælian. Var. Hist.* l. 4. c. 17.

^y *Jamblicus vit. Pythag.* l. 1. c. 23.

^z One scarce meets with any thing in Antiquity concerning *Pythagoras's* Knowledge in *Physics*, but what, when attentively considered,

It appears then, on the whole, that the double Doctrine was used for the sake of Society; their high Notions of which made them conclude this Practice to be not only innocent, but laudable: Whereas, was the Motive either love of Mystery, of Fraud, or of themselves, it cannot be reconciled to any of their several Systems of private Morals.

III. My *third general Reason* was, that the ancient Sages seemed to practise the *double Doctrine*, in the Point in Question. For I have observed, that those *Sects* which joined *Legislation* with *Philosophy*, as the *Pythagoreans*, *Platonists*, *Peripatetics*, and *Stoics*, always professed the Belief of a future State of Rewards and Punishments: While *those*, who *simply philosophised*, as the *Cyrenaic*, the *Cynic*, and the *Democritic*, publicly professed the Contrary. And where those of the legislating Class were more or less in the Practice of that Art, so were they more or less in the Profession of a future State. As on the one Hand, the *Pythagoric* and *Platonic*; on the o-

considered, gives us fresh Cause to admire the miraculous Sagacity of that prodigious Man. This Story of his *predicting Earthquakes*, has much the Air of a Fable: And I believe, has been generally ranked, as it is by *Stanley*, with the Abundance of that idle Trumpery, which the enthusiastical *Pythagoreans* and *Platonists* of later Ages have raked together concerning him. Yet a late Relation, which I am about to quote, has fully vindicated the Truth of it; and Posterity, that could not profit by his Knowledge, has at least confirmed the Veracity of his History. *Paul Dudley Esq;* in the *Phil. Trans.* No. 437. p. 72. speaking of an Earthquake which lately happened in *New England*, hath these remarkable Words: — *A Neighbour of mine that has a Well 36. Feet deep, about three Days before the Earthquake, was surprized to find his Water that used to be very sweet and limpid, sink to that Degree that they could make no Use of it, nor scarce bear the House when it was brought in; and thinking some Carrion was got into the Well, he searched the Bottom, but found it clear and good, though the Colour of the Water was turned wheyish, or pale. In about seven Days after the Earthquake, his Water began to mend, and in three Days more returned to its former Sweetness and Colour.*

ther,

ther, the *Peripatetic* and *Stoic*, nay in one and the same Sect, as the *Peripatetic*, or *Stoic*, where a Follower of it studied Legislation, he professed this belief; where he confined himself to private Morals, or abstract Speculations, he denied it. So amongst the Stoics, *Zeno* was a great Propagater of it; while *Epictetus* absolutely rejected it. And *Seneca*, who was but a Mongrel, seems willing to expose the whole Mystery. For in those Parts of his Writings, where he strictly philosophises, he denies a future State; and in those, where he affects the Politician, he maintains it. And having said what he thought fit in Behalf of it, is not ashamed to add, “*Hæc autem omnia ad MORES spectant, itaque suo loco posita sunt: at quæ à DIALECTICIS contra hanc opinionem dicuntur, segreganda fuerunt: et ideo seposita sunt*”^a. As much as to say, the Doctrine was preached up as useful to Society, but intenable by Reason. One might push this Observation from whole Sects to particulars. So *Xenophon* and *Isocrates*, who concerned themselves much in the Public, declared for it; and *Hippocrates* and *Galen*, who confined themselves to natural Studies, against it.

This enervates what might be urged for the common Opinion, from those many Professions in the Writings of the Theistical Philosophers, in favour of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, as shewing those were only Part of the external or popular Doctrines of such Sects. It may likewise help to explain and reconcile an infinite Number of Discordances in their Works in general; and more especially on this Point; which are commonly, though I think falsely, attributed to their Inconstancy. What endless Disputes have there been amongst the Learned, since the Revival of

^a *Ep.* 103.

Letters, about what *Plato*, *Aristotle*, and the *Stoics* held of the Soul. But it was not the Moderns only who found themselves here at a loss, the Ancients themselves were sometimes embarrassed: *Plutarch* complains heavily of the *Repugnances of the Stoics*: and, in his Tract so entituled, accuses *Chrysippus* for laughing, one while, at the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, as a Mismo, fit only to fright Women and Children; and another, for affirming seriously, that, let Men laugh as they would, the Thing was a sober Truth.

IV. My *fourth general Reason* is gathered from the Opinion that Antiquity itself seems to have had of its Philosophers on this Point. Their gravest Writers (as we may see in part, by the Quotations in the Beginning of this Book from *Timæus* the *Locrian*, *Polybius*, and *Strabo*) are full of Apologies for the national Religions: that is, for what was taught therein, concerning a Providence *here*, and especially the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments *hereafter*. They pretend that these Things were necessary to keep the People in awe; but frankly own, that was Society composed all of wise Men, *the Religion of the Philosophers*, which inforces Morality by Considerations drawn from the Excellence of Virtue, the Dignity of our Nature, and the Perfection of the Soul, would be a fitter and more excellent Way to Good. Now here, the *national Religions*, as they taught a Doctrine of a future State, being opposed to the *Religion of the Philosophers*, which employed other Motives; I conclude, that, in the Opinion of these Apologists, the Philosophers did not really believe *this Doctrine*.

V. My *last general Argument* against the common Opinion, is collected from an extraordinary Circumstance

cumstance in the *Roman History*. *Cæsar*, in his Speech to the Senate, to dissuade them from capitally punishing the Followers of *Catiline*, argues thus, *that Death was no Evil, as they, who inflicted it for a Punishment, imagined and intended it*. And thereon takes occasion, 'with a Licentiousness' till then unknown to that august Assembly, to explain and enforce the *avowed Principles of Epicurus* (of whose Sect he was) concerning the *Mortality of the Soul*^c. Now when *Cato* and *Cicero*, who both urged the Death of the Conspirators, come to reply to his Argument for Lenity; instead of opposing the Principles of that Philosophy by the avowed Principles of a better, they content themselves with only saying, *that the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments was delivered down to them from their Ancestors*. "*Cæsar* (says *Cato*) "*bene & composite paulo ante, in hoc ordine, de*
"vita & morte differuit, credo falsa existumans ea
"quæ de inferis MEMORANTUR^d:" without giving one Reason, so much as his own Opinion, to support it. *Cicero's* Reply is to the same purpose: "*Itaque ut aliqua in vita formido improbis esset*
"posita, apud inferos ejusmodi quædam illi AN-
"TIQVI supplicia impiis constituta esse voluerunt:
"quòd videlicet intelligebant, his remotis, non
"esse mortem ipsam pertimescendam^e:". From this cold Manner of evading the Argument, by opposing to it only the Opinion of their Ancestors, I conclude, these two great Patriots were conscious that the real Opinion of the ancient Philosophy would not help them out: For nothing could be

^c De pœna, possum equidem dicere id quod res habet; in luctu atque miseriis, mortem ærumnarum requiem, non cruciatum esse; eam cuncta mortalium mala dissolvere; ultra neque curæ, neque gaudio locum esse. *Cæsar* apud Sall. de Bell. Catilin.

^d Apud eundem. ^e Orat. IV. in Catilin. § 4.

more illogical than their Reply, it being evidently *that Authority of their Ancestors*, which *Cæsar* opposed with the Principles of the *Greek Philosophy*. Here then was a fair Challenge to a Philosophic Examination; and can we believe, these two Patriots would be less favourably heard, while they defended the Doctrine of a future State on the Principles of *Plato* and *Zeno*, so agreeable to the Opinions of their Ancestors, than *Cæsar* in overthrowing it on the System of *Epicurus*? Or was it of small Importance to the State, that an Opinion, which *Tully*, in the Words above, tells us was established by their Ancestors for the Service of Society, should be shewn to be conformable to the Conclusions of the most creditable Philosophy? For all this, as we say, instead of attempting to prove *Cæsar* a bad Philosopher, they content themselves with giving a Hint only that he was a bad Citizen. We must needs conclude then, that these two learned Men were sufficiently apprized, that this Opinion of their Ancestors was unsupported by the real Opinion of any *Greek Sect* of Philosophy; and to have urged their *popular* Profession of it, would have been to no purpose, against *Cæsar* and such of the Senate as were instructed in these Matters: because the Mystery of the *double Doctrine*, and the Part to which this Point belonged, was a Thing well known to them.

It is true, that in *Cato*, who was a rigid Stoic, the Observation will conclude only against his Sect, but it will conclude very strongly: for *Cato* was so far from thinking that the Principles of that Philosophy should not be brought into the Conclusions of State, where it could be done with any Advantage; that he was even for having public Measures regulated on the Standard of their *Paradoxes*: for which he is sharply ridiculed by *Cicero*

in his Oration for *Muræna*. He could not then, we must believe, have neglected so fair an Opportunity of employing his beloved Philosophy upon *Cæsar's* Challenge, would it have served his Purpose.

But though *Cato's* Case only includes the Stoics, *Cicero's*, who was of the Middle Academy, that indifferently made use of the Principles of any Sect to confute the rest, includes them all. It will perhaps be said, that the Reason why *Tully* declined the Advantage his Sect gave him, of replying on any philosophic Principles, was because he thought the Opinion of their Ancestors the strongest Argument of all; having *ſo*, actually, declared it, in a more evident Point, the *Being of a God* itself: ID QUOD MAXIMUM EST MAJORUM NOSTRORUM SAPIENTIA, *qui ſacra, qui ceremonias, &c.*^f But it is to be observed, this was ſpoken to the People, and recommended to them as an Argument they might beſt conſide in; and therefore urged with *Tully's* uſual Prudence, who always ſuited his Arguments to his Auditors: while the Words under Queſtion were ſpoken in the Senate to an Audience, which, as we ſhall ſee by what follows, and as we may partly ſee by what went before^g, had, at that time, a great Affectation to philoſophiſe. And how much this kind of Diſputation pleaſed *Cicero*, appears by the Apology he made for it, in his Oration for *Muræna*: “ Et quoniam non eſt
“ nobis hæc Oratio habenda aut cum imperita mul-
“ titudine, aut in aliquo conventu agreſtium, audacius
“ paulo de ſtudiis humanitatis, quæ & mihi & vobis
“ nota & jucunda ſunt, diſputabo^h.”

^f Orat. pro Milone.

^g Namely, by *Cæſar's* running into that Way, which, otherwiſe, a Man who knew the World ſo well, would ſcarce have done.

^h Sect. 29.

S E C T. III.

HAVING premised thus much to clear our Way, and abate the Prejudices against a new Opinion, I come now to a particular Examination of each *Seet* that hath been supposed to believe the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments.

The ancient *Greek* Philosophy may be all ranged in the *ELEATIC*, the *ITALIC*, and the *IONIC* Lines. The *Eleatic* Line was wholly composed of Atheists of different Kinds; as the *Democritic*, the *Pyrronian*, the *Epicurean*, &c. so these come not into our Accounts. All in the *Italic* Line, derive from *PYTHAGORAS*, and swear in his Name. All in the *Ionic*, 'till *SOCRATES*, busied themselves only in Physics, and are therefore likewise out of the Question: HE it was that first brought Philosophy out of the Clouds, to a clear Contemplation of human Nature; and founded the *Socratic School*, whose Subdivisions were the *PLATONIC* or *Old Academic*, the *PERIPATETIC*, the *STOIC*, the *MIDDLE*, and the *NEW ACADEMY*.

As to *Socrates*, this Character is delivered of him by *Cicero*, that *He was the first who called Philosophy from Heaven to Earth*: “*Primus Philosophiam devocavit a cœlo, & in urbibus collocavit, & in domos etiam introduxit*.” We must

i Tuscul. Quæst. l. 5. And again, Acad. l. 1. Socrates mihi videtur; id quod constat inter omnes, primus a rebus occultis, & ab ipsa natura involutis, in quibus omnes ante eum philosophi occupati fuerunt, evocavisse Philosophiam, & ad vitam communem adduxisse, ut de virtutibus & vitiis, omninoque de bonis rebus & malis quæreret; cœlestia autem vel procul esse a nostra cognitione censeret, vel si maxime cognita essent, nihil tamen ad bene vivere conferre.

not suppose, *Tully* here meant *simply*, as the Words seem to imply, *that Socrates was the first of the Philosophers who studied public and private Morals*: this being evidently false. For the *Pythagoric School* had, for a long time before, made *these* its principal Concern. He must therefore mean (as the Quotation below partly implies) that *He was the first who called off Philosophy from its Contemplation of Nature to fix it ENTIRELY upon Morals*. This was so remarkably and exactly true, that *Socrates* was not only the *first*, but the *last* of the Philosophers that did so; having in this no Followers, unless we reckon *Xenophon*, who upbraids *Plato*, the immediate Successor of his School, for forsaking his Master's contracted Scheme, and imitating the common Practice of the Philosophers in their Pursuit of general Knowledge.

However, this was a very extraordinary Revolution which *Socrates* attempted in Philosophy: and to support it, he brought in those Principles of Doubt and Uncertainty, which some of his *pretended* Followers, as we shall see presently, very much abused: For while he restrained to those Principles natural Enquiries, which he rejected; *they* extended them to every Thing that was the Subject of human Disquisition. This we presume was *Socrates's* true Character: and thus confining his Enquiries, it is remarkable, that he, and he only, of all the ancient *Greek* Philosophers, really believed the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments. How it happened that he was so *singularly* right, will be considered hereafter, when we bring his Case to illustrate, and confirm the general Position we are here establishing.

From *Socrates*, as we said, came the *Middle and New Academy*, as well as the *Old, or Platonic*: *Arcesilaus* was the Founder of the *Middle*; and *C Carneades*

Carneades of the *New*. Between the Principles of these two there was no real Difference, as *Tully* tells us, and we may take his Word: but both I will venture to affirm, were as real *Sceptics*, as *that* which was so denominated: I mean in their *Principles* of philosophising, though not in the *professed Conclusions* each pretended to draw from thence. For as well *Academics* as *Sceptics* agreed in this, *That nothing could be known; and that, without interfering with any Sentiments of their own, every thing was to be disputed.* Hence the *Sceptics* concluded, *that nothing was ever to be assented to, but the Mind kept in an eternal Suspense:* The *Academics*, on the contrary, *that the PROBABLE, when found, was to be assented to; but, 'till then, they were to go on with the Sceptics, questioning, disputing, and contradicting every Thing.* And here lay the Joke: they continued doing this all the Time of their Existence, without ever finding the *Probable* in any Thing; excepting only in what was necessary to supply them with Arms for disputing against every Thing. It is true, this was a Contradiction in their Scheme: but *Scepticism* is unavoidably destructive of itself. The Mischief was, that their allowing the *probable* thus far, made many, both *Ancients* and *Moderns*, think they were uniform in their Allowance: In the mean time they gave good Words, and talked perpetually of their *Verisimile* and *Probabile*, amidst a Situation of absolute Doubt, Darknes, and *Scepticism*; like *Sancho Pancha* of his *Island* on the *Terra Firma*.

This I take to be the true Key to the Intrigues of the *Academy*, of which famous Sect many have been betrayed into a better Opinion than was fitting. If any Doubt remains, the Account which *Tully* himself gives of these People, will remove it. He, who knew them best, and who espoused only

the more reasonable Part of their Conduct, tells us, that they held nothing could be known, or so much as perceived: — “*Opinionibus & institutis omnia teneri; nihil veritati relinqui: deinceps omnia tenebris circumfusa esse dixerunt. Itaque Arcefilaus negabat esse quidquam quod sciri posset, ne illud quidem ipsum^k:*” That every Thing was to be disputed; and that the *Probable* was not a Thing to engage their Assents, or sway their Judgments, but to enforce their Reasonings. — “*Carneades vero multo uberius iisdem de rebus loquebatur: non quo aperiret sententiam suam (hic enim mos patrius Academicæ ADVERSARI SEMPER OMNIBUS in disputando) sed, &c.^l — Proprium sit Academicæ judicium suum nullum interponere, ea probare quæ simillima veri videantur; conferre causas, & quid in quamque sententiam dici possit expromere, nulla adhibita sua autoritate, judicium audientium relinquere integrum & liberum^m.*” That, though they pretended their End was to find the *Probable*, yet, like the Sceptics, they held their Mind in an eternal Suspense, and continued going on disputing against every Thing, without ever finding the *Probable* to determine their Judgments. — “*Restat (says Lucullus) illud quod dicunt veri inveniendi causa contra omnia dici oportere & pro omnibus. VOLO igitur VIDERE QUID INVENERINT: Non solemus, inquit, ostendere.*”

Thus it appears, the Sect was thoroughly sceptical: And *Sextus Impericus*, a Master of this Argument, says no less: who, though he denies the Academics and Sceptics were exactly the same, as some Ancients affirmed, because though both a-

^k Acad. Quest. lib. 1. c. 12, 13. ^l De Oret. lib. 1. c. 18.
^m De Dial. lib. 2. sub fin. ⁿ Acad. Quest. lib. 4. c. 18.

greed that Truth could not be found, yet the Academics held there was a Difference in those Things which pretended to it (the Mystery of which has been revealed above) yet owns that *Arcefilaus* and *Pyrrho* had one common Philosophy°.

But now a Difficulty obtrudes itself, that will require some Explanation. We have represented the Academy as quite sceptical: We have represented *Socrates* as a Dogmatist; and yet on his sole Authority, as we are assured by *Tully*, did this Sect hold its Principles of *Knowing nothing* and *disputing all Things*. The true Solution seems to be this.

1. *Socrates*, to deter his Hearers from every Study but that of Morality, was perpetually representing the Obscurity, in which they lay involved: not only affirming that he knew nothing of them, but that nothing could be known: while in Morals he was a Dogmatist, as appears largely by *Xenophon*, and the less fabulous Parts of *Plato*. But *Arcefilaus* and *Carneades* took him at his word, when he said *he knew nothing*; and extended that Principle of Uncertainty to all Things disputable.

2. Again, the Adversaries, with whom *Socrates* had to deal, in his Project of discrediting natural Knowledge, and recommending the Study of Morality, were the SOPHISTS, properly so called; a Race of Men, who by their Fallacies and Eloquence, had long kept up the Credit of the *one*, and much vitiated the Purity of the *other*: And these being the Oracles of Science at that Time in *Athens*, it became the Modesty and Humility of his Pretensions, to attack them covertly; and

° Ο μέντοι Αρχεσίλαος, ὃν τῇ μέσῃς Ἀκαδημίας ἐλέγομεν ἔχει προτά-
την καὶ ἀρχήν, πᾶν μοι δοκεῖ τοῖς Περικρανέσις κοινῶς λόγους ὡς
μὲν ἔχει χεῖρον τὴν κατ' αὐτὴν αἰγὴν καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν. *Hypot. Pyrr.*
lib. 1. c. 33.

rather as an Enquirer than a Teacher. This produced the Method of disputing by *Interrogation*, from the Inventer, called the *Socratic*: And as this could not be carried on but under a professed Admiration of their Wisdom, and Acquiescence in their Decisions, it gave birth to the famous *Attic Irony*. Hence it appears, his Way of Confutation must be, by turning their own Principles and Concessions against them, and *advancing nothing of his own*.

Now *Arcefilaus* and *Carneades* having, as we say, extravagantly extended the *Socratic* Principle of *knowing nothing*; easily mistook this other, of *advancing nothing of his own against the Sophists*, as a necessary Consequence of the former: and so made that a general Rule for their School, which, in their Master, was only an occasional Practice.

On these two mistaken Principles was the New Academy erected. — “*Omnia latere in occulto, nec esse quidquam, quod cerni aut intelligi possit: quibus de causis nihil oportere neque profiteri, neque affirmare quemquam, neque assertionem ap- probare*.”

But they of the *Old Academy*⁹, the immediate

⁷ *Acad. Quæst. lib. 1. c. 12.*

⁹ That those of the *Old Academy* were Dogmatists, *Tully* assures us, with full Evidence, where he says, *Quæst. Acad. lib. 1. Nihil enim inter PERIPATETICOS & ACADEMIAM illam VETEREM differebat*. For that the Peripatetics were Dogmatists, no body ever questioned: Yet the same *Tully* seems to take away with one Hand what he gave with the other, when he says, towards the Conclusion of this 1st Book, *Hanc Academiam NOVAM appellabant, quæ mihi VETUS videtur*. Here then the *Old Academy* is become sceptical: for such certainly was the *New*. The true Way of reconciling *Cicero* to himself I take to be this: — Where he speaks of the Conformity between the Peripatetics and the *Old Academy*, he considers it under *Plato*, as the Founder: and where, of the Conformity between the *New* and *It*, he considers it as under *Socrates*. For the *New Academy*, as we here see, claimed the nearest Relation to their Master.

Followers of *Socrates*, with more Judgment, declined their Master's Method of Disputation; easily perceiving that it was adapted to the Occasion: and that to make such of general Practice, and the Characteristic of their School, would be irrational and absurd. But now the *Middle* and *New*, instead of profiting by this sage Conduct of their Predecessors, made it a Handle to extol their own closer Adherence to their Master; and an Argument that they were returned to his true Principles, from which the *Old* had faultily deviated. A Passage in *Tully* will justify these Observations; and these Observations will explain that Passage: which, I presume, without them would not be thought very intelligible. Thus he expresses himself, under the Character of his Sect: — “ *Primùm, inquam, de-*
“ *precor ne me, tamquam philosophum, putetis*
“ *scholam vobis aliquam explicaturum: quod ne*
“ *in ipsis quidem philosophis magnopere unquam*
“ *probavi: quando enim Socrates, qui parens philo-*
“ *sophiæ jure dici potest, quidquam tale fecit? eorum*
“ *erat iste mos, qui tum Sophistæ nominabantur;*
“ *quorum è numero primus est ausus Leontinus*
“ *Gorgias in conventu poscere quæstionem, id est,*
“ *jubere dicere, qua de re quis vellet audire. Au-*
“ *dax negotium; dicerem impudens, nisi hoc in-*
“ *stitutum postea translatum ad philosophos nostros esset.*
“ *Sed & illum, quem nominavi, & ceteros Sophi-*
“ *stas, ut è Platone intelligi potest, lufos videmus à*
“ *Socrate. Is enim percunctando atque interrogan-*
“ *do elicere solebat eorum opiniones, quibuscum*
“ *differebat, ut ad ea, quæ ii respondissent, si quid*
“ *videretur, diceret: QUI MOS CUM A POSTERI-*
“ *ORIBUS NON ESSET RETENTUS, ARCESILAUS*
“ *EUM REVOCAVIT INSTITUITQUE, ut ii, qui se*
“ *audire vellent, non de se quærerent, sed ipsi dicerent.*
“ *quid*

“*quid sentirent : quod cum dixissent, ille contra.*” Here *Cicero* has gilded the artful but false Colours of his Sect : which not only represented their Scepticism, as a Return to the true Principles of *Socrates* ; but would have the dogmatic Sects of Philosophy, against all Evidence of Antiquity, the late Product of that Race of Sophists, with whom the Godlike Man had to do. But the *Old Academy* we may be sure had a different Notion of the Matter : *Lucullus* says of *Arcefilaus*, — *Nonne jam cum philosophorum disciplinæ gravissimæ constitissent, tum ut exortus est in optima Rep. Tiberius Graccus, qui ocium perturbaret, sic Arcefilaus, qui constitutam philosophiam everteret.*

However these bold Pretensions of restoring the School of *Socrates* to its Integrity, deluded many of the Ancients ; and made them, as particularly *Diogenes Laertius*, to rank him in the Number of the Sceptics.

On the whole it appears that the Academics, as distinguished from the Platonists, were mere Sceptics ; and so, like that Sect, to be thrown out of our Account. Those then remaining, whose Sentiments it is to the purpose to enquire into, will be the PYTHAGORIC, the PLATONIC, the PERIPATETIC, and the STOIC : And if, on Examination of these four renowned Schools, the PHILOSOPHIC QUATERNION of dogmatic Theists, it be found that none of them believed, though all sedulously taught, the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, the Reader will perhaps be willing to conclude with me, that it was not the real Opinion of any *Grecian* Sect.

I. PYTHAGORAS comes first under Examination. He is said to have invented the Name long

^r *De Fin. Bon. & Mal. lib. 2 c. 1.*

after the Existence of his Profession; and was, as we may say, the middle Link that connected together the *Legislators* and *Philosophers*; being indeed the only *Greek* that was properly and fully both one and the other: though, from his Time, and in Conformity to his Practice, not only all of his own School, but even of the *other three*, dealt much in Legislation: In which his Fortune was like that of *Socrates*; who was the first and last of the *Philosophers* that *confined* himself to *Morals*; though, in Imitation of his Conduct, *Morals*, from thence, made the chief Business of all the Subdivisions of his School.

In the Science of Legislation, ORPHEUS^f, for whom he had the highest Reverence, was his only Master; and in Philosophy, PHARECYDES SYRUS^g. Which last Circumstance we desire may be kept in mind, as of Importance for the Discovery of *Pythagoras's* real Sentiment in the Point in Question.

After he had formed his Character on these two different Models, being ambitious of reaching to the Fountain-head of Science, he travelled into EGYPT; where, after a long and painful Initiation, he participated of all the Mysteries of the Priesthood.

He had now so thoroughly imbibed the Spirit of Legislation, that he not only pretended his *Laws* were inspired, which most other Law-givers had done; but his *PHILOSOPHY* likewise^h; which no other *Philosopher* ever presumed to do.

This, we may be sure, would incline him to a more than ordinary Cultivation of the *double Doctrine*. And, indeed, he was so eminent in the Practice, that the *secret* or *esoteric Doctrine* of *Pythagoras*, became proverbial. For what End he

^f *Jamblicus de vita Pyth.* c. 151. ^g *Id. ib.* c. 184.

^h *Jamb. vit. Pyth.* c. 1.

did it, *Varro* informs us, in *St. Auslin*, where he says, that *Pythagoras* instructed his Auditors in the Science of Legislation LAST OF ALL, when they were now become learned, wise, and happy. — And on what Subject, appears from a common Saying of the Sect, that in these Things which relate to the Gods, ALL was not to be revealed to all^w.

The Communities he gave Laws to, the Cities he set free, are known to every one: And that nothing might be wanting to his *Legislative Character*, he likewise, in Conformity to the general Practice, instituted MYSTERIES; in which was taught, as usual, the *Unity of the Divine Nature*^x. Nay so much did his *Legislative* prevail over his *Philosophic* Character, that he brought not only the Principles^y of the *Mysteries* into the *Schools*, but likewise several of the Observances; as Abstinence from *Beans* and several kinds of Animals: which afterwards contributed not a little to confound the *secret Doctrines* of the *Schools* and the *Mysteries*. This Conformity was, without doubt, the Reason why the *Crotoniates*, or the *Metapontines* (for in this Authors differ^z) turned his House or School, after his Death, into a TEMPLE of CERES.

Thus the Fame and Authority of *Pythagoras* became inconceivably great over all Greece and Italy.

^w Μὴ ἢ πρὸς πάντας πάντε ὁσά.

^x — Ἀγέμεν ὃ αὐτῶν τὰς καθαρὰς, καὶ τὰς λειτουργίας ΤΕΛΕΤΑΣ, τὴν ἈΚΡΙΒΕΣΤΑΤΗΝ Εἰδήσιν αὐτῶν [ἢ θεῶν] ἔχοντα. ἔτι ὃ φασι καὶ συνέθετο αὐτὴν ποιῆσαι τὴν θείαν φιλοσοφίαν καὶ διδασκείαν· ἃ μὲν μαθητὰς ὡς ἡ ΤΟΡΦΙΚΩΝ, ἃ δὲ ὡς ἡ Αἰγυπτίων ἱερέων, ἃ δὲ ὡς ἡ Χαλδαίων καὶ Μεδων, ἃ δὲ ὡς ἡ Τελετῆς, ἃ δὲ ἡ Ἑλευσίνι γομφίαι, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τε, καὶ Σαυροφάγῃ, ἔδεικνυν, καὶ εἴ τι ὡς αὐτοῖς, ἔπειτα τὰς Κελεύσεις καὶ τὴν Ἱστορίαν. *Jambli. de vit. Pyth.* § 151.

^y See Book II. Sect. 4. p. 147.

^z *Diog. Laert. lib. 8. § 17. Porph. de vit. Pyth. N° 4.*

Herodotus calls him, the most authoritative of Philosophers^a. Cicero says of him, — “Cum, Superbo re-
gnante, in Italiam venisset, tenuit Magnam il-
lam Græciam cum HONORE EX DISCIPLINA,
tum etiam AUCTORITATE^b.”

And this was no transient Reputation: It descended to his Followers, through a long Succes-

^a — Ὁν τῶ ἀδυνάτω σοφιστῇ Πυθαγόρῃ — lib. 4. § 95. literally, not of the least Authority: a common Figure in the ancient Languages. So Homer, in the 15th Iliad, calls Achilles, ὁ ἀπαισέστατος Ἀχαιῶν, not the worst Soldier of the Greeks; meaning, we know, the best.

^b Tusc. Disp. lib. 1. c. 16. — Honore refers to his Philosophic Character; and Auctoritate, to his Legislative. The common Reading is, cum honore & disciplinâ, tum etiam auctoritate. Dr. B. in his Emendations on the Tusc. Quæst. saw this was faulty; but not reflecting on the two-fold Character of Pythagoras, and, perhaps, not attending to Tully's Purpose (which was not to speak of the Nature of his Philosophy, but of the Reputation he had in Magna Græcia) he seems not to have hit upon the true Reading. He objects to Honore, because the Particles cum and tum require a greater Difference in the Things spoken of, than is to be found in Honos and Auctoritas: which Reasoning would have been just, had only a philosophic Character, or only a legislative, been the Subject. But it was Tully's plain Meaning, to present Pythagoras under both these Views: So that Honos, which is the proper Consequence of succeeding in the first; and Auctoritas, of succeeding in the latter; have all the real Difference that cum and tum require: At least, Plutarch thought so, when he applied these very Words to the Egyptian Soldiery and the Priesthood; to whom, like the Legislator and Philosopher, the one having Power and the other Wisdom, Auctoritas and Honos distinctly belong: — ἡ δὲ δυνάμις, ἡ δὲ ἀρετὴ σοφίαν, &c. AΞΙΩΜΑ & ΤΙΜΗΝ ἔχουσιν. De Isid. & Osir. Another Objection the learned Critic brings against the common Reading, has more Weight: which is, that, in Honore & Disciplina, two Words are joined together as very similar in Sense, which have scarce any Affinity or Relation to one another: on which account, he would read MORE & Disciplina. But this, as appears from what has been said above, renders the whole Sentence lame and imperfect: I would venture therefore to read, only changing a single Letter, — tenuit Magnam illam Græciam cum honore EX disciplina, tum etiam auctoritate: and then all will be right; ex Disciplina referring equally to Honore & Auctoritate.

sion;

sion; to whom the Cities of *Italy* frequently committed the Administration of their Affairs^c; where they so well established their Authority, that *St. Jerom* tells us, very lasting Marks were remaining of it to his Time: *Respice omnem oram Italiæ, quæ quondam Magna Græcia dicebatur; & Pythagoreorum dogmatum incisa publicis literis æra cognosces*^d.

But there are two Circumstances, that must needs give us the highest Idea of *Pythagoras's* Reputation in point of Politics.

1. The *one* is, that almost every Legislator of Name, for some time *before* and *after*, as well as *during his Time*, were numbered amongst his Disciples; the popular Opinion being, that nothing could be done to purpose in this Matter, that did not come from *Pythagoras*.

2. The *other* is, that the Doctrine of the Dispensation of Providence, by a *Metempsychosis* or transmigration of the Soul, though taught in all the Mysteries, and an inseparable Part of a future State in all the Religions of Paganism, should become to be esteemed the *peculiar Doctrine* of *Pythagoras*.

And here the Reader will pardon a short Digression, not a little illustrating the Point we are upon.

There is not a more extraordinary Book in all Antiquity, than the *Metamorphosis* of *Ovid*; whether we regard the Matter or the Form. The *Tales* appear monstrously extravagant; and the Composition irregular and wild: Had it been the Product of a dark Age, and a barbarous Writer,

^c Πυθαγόρας δ' ἔχει πολλὰ κ' τὰ Ἰταλῶν ἦτορ ἰθαυμάζετο, αὐτὸς τε κ' οἱ σωόντες αὐτῷ ἑταῖροι, ὥστε ὁ τὰς πολιτείας τοῖς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶτίθειεν τὰς πόλεις. *Porph. de vit. Pyth. N° 54.*

^d *Cont. Ruf. lib. 2.*

we could have been content to have ranked it in the Class of our modern Oriental Fables, as a Matter of no Consequence. But when we consider it as wrote while *Rome* was in its Meridian of Knowledge and Politeness; and by an Author, who, as appears from his Acquaintance with the *Greek* Tragic Writers, knew well what belonged to a Work or Composition, we cannot but be shocked at the grotesque Assemblage of its Parts: One would rather therefore distrust one's Judgment, and conclude the Deformity to be only in Appearance: which perhaps, on Examination, we shall find to be the Case. Though it must be owned, the common Opinion seems to be supported by *Quintilian*, the most judicious Critic of Antiquity, who speaks of our Author and his Work, in these Words: — “ ut *Ovidius* lascivire in *Metamor-*
 “ *phosi* solet, quem tamen excusare necessitas potest,
 “ RES DIVERSISSIMAS IN SPECIEM UNIUS COR-
 “ PORIS COLLIGENTEM.”

But before we can come to this, we must consider the Origin of the ancient Fables in general.

There are *two Opinions* concerning it.

I. The *first* is, of those who think them contrived by the ancient Sages for Repositories of their mysterious Wisdom; and, consequently, that they are no less than *natural*, *moral*, and *divine* Truths, fantastically disguised. The learned Reader will not need a Confutation of this Opinion: I shall only observe, it was well for Truth, that none of the ancient Allegorists entered upon their Task with any thing like the Spirit of our great *Bacon*^e; the creative Power of whose Genius so nearly realized these Reveries, as sometimes to put us to a stand,

^e *Instit. Orat. lib. 4. c. 1. sub fin.*

^f *De Sapientia Veterum.*

whether we should not prefer the Riches and Beauty of his Imagination, to the poor and meagre Truth that lies at bottom.

But the *Original* of the Mistake may not be so commonly attended to: The Philosophers, I persuade myself, invented and revived this Way of Interpretation, as at two different Times, so on two different Occasions.

1. The ancient *Greek* Poets, the Repertories of Pagan Mythology, were in the Number of their most revered Divines; and the Writings of *Homer* a kind of *sacred Scripture*: So that the Absurdities of the LETTER beginning, as the Times grew polite and inquisitive, to abate the popular Veneration for them; the Philosophers, who thought the established Worship concerned in their Support, invented this Method to cover and secure their Reputation.

2. What these began for the sake of their *Theologers*, their Successors continued for the sake of their *Theology*. For when the Propagaters of Christianity set upon exposing the Absurdities of vulgar Paganism, these Defenders of it seized the Way of Allegory to cover it from Ignominy: An Evasion, their Adversaries could with no grace object to, while they *borrowed* that very Method to *spiritualize*, forsooth, their sacred Writings; which the Pagans had long used with more Pretence and better Judgment to make theirs *reasonable*.

II. The *other Opinion* of the Origin of the Fables, is that which supposes them the Corruptions of Civil History, and consequently, as having their Foundation in real Facts; and this is unquestionably the true. It would lead me too far from my Subject, to shew in this Place, which of the Fables arose from the *Ambiguity of Words*; which, from the *high Figures of Poetry*; and which, from
the

the *politic Representations of Statesmen* : and how the *Passion of Admiration* procured an easy Admittance into barbarous Minds, for all these various Delusions.

But we must not omit, that the Followers of this Opinion are divided into two Parties ; *one* of which would have the ancient Fables the Corruption of *profane History* only ; the *other*, only of *sacred*.

This *last* seems unsupported by every Thing but a pious Intention of doing Honour to *the Bible* : For by what we can collect from *Pagan* or even *Jewish* Antiquity, the History of that People was less celebrated or known, than of any People whatsoever. But known or unknown, it is somewhat hard, methinks, that they will not allow *Greece* the Honour of producing one single Hero ; but that they must be all fetched from *Palestine*. One would have thought, the *Number* of the *Pagan Worthies*, and the *Paucity* of the *Jewish*, might have induced our Critics to afford *those* some home-spun Heroes of a second Rate at least. But this, it seems, would look so like a sacrilegious Compromise, that an Expedient is contrived to lessen this Disparity of Numbers : And *Moses* alone is found to be *Apollo, Pan, Priapus, Cecrops, Minos, Orpheus, Amphion, Tiresias, Janus, Evander, Romulus*, and about some twenty more of the *Pagan Gods and Heroes*. So says the learned and *judicious* Mr. *Huet*^s : who, not content to seize all he meets with as lawful Prize within the Waste of fabulous Times, makes cruel Inroads into the cultivated Ages of History, and will scarce allow *Rome* to have its own Founderⁿ.

^s *Demonstratio Evangelica.*

ⁿ Si fidem sequimur historiarum, fabulosa pleraque de eo [Romulo] narrari. *Prop. 4. § 8.*

Nay, so jealous are they of this Fairy Honour paid to *Scripture*, that I have met with those who thought it much intrenched upon, to believe that there was any other Origin of human Sacrifices, than the Command to *Abraham* to offer up his Son. This contending for so extraordinary an Invention, puts one in mind of those Grammarians, who, out of a *due Regard* to the *Glory of ancient Times*, will not admit either the Great or Small Pox to be modern Discoveries, but vindicate those inestimable Blessings to all-knowing Antiquity.

But he who wants to be convinced of the Folly of these Notions, can hardly do better than read over the Workⁱ of one Mr. *De Laveur*, the best and latest Supporter of them.

The other Party then, who esteem the *Fables* a Corruption of Pagan History, appear in general to be right. But the Misfortune is, the Spirit of System seems to have possessed these likewise, while they will allow nothing to *Jewish History*: For that Principle, which makes them admit the *Egyptian* and *Phœnician* to a Share with the *Grecian*, should reasonably have disposed them to admit the *Jewish* into Partnership; though it might perhaps bring the least Contribution. And he that does not see^b that *Philemon* and *Baucis* is taken from the Story of *Lot*, must be very blind: Though he^c that

ⁱ *Histoire de la Fable conferée avec l'Histoire Sainte.* Amst.

1731.

^b La fable de Philemon & de Baucis — les personnages sont connus, & j'en ai rien d'intéressant à en dire: car de penser avec Mr. Huet, qu'elle nous cache l'Histoire des Anges qui allerent visiter Abraham, c'est une de ces imaginations hazardées dans lesquelles ce savant Prelat, &c. *Banier les Metam. d'Ovide, explic. des Fables* 7, 8, 9, & 10. Lib. 8.

^c *Voiez Laveur. Histoire de la Fable. Cap. Jason & les Argonautes, à la fin.* — Ainsi cette fable est toute composée des traditions que les Chananéens ou Phœniciens avoient répandues dans leurs voyages.

that can discover the Expedition of the *Israelites* from *Egypt* to *Palestine*, in the Fable of the *Argonautes*, is certainly blest with the Gift of double Sight.

Such was the general Original of the *Fables*: but we must be a little more explicite concerning those in question, the *METAMORPHOSES*.

The *Metempsychosis* was, as we have said, the religious Method, amongst the Ancients, of explaining the Ways of Providence; which, as they were seen to be unequal *here*, were supposed to be rectified *hereafter*. But this Inequality was never thought so great, as to leave no Foot-steps of a Superintendency: For the People of old argued thus, — If there was no Inequality, *nothing would want to be set right*; and if there was nothing but Inequality, there would be *no one to set it right*. So that a regular Providence, or none at all, equally subverted their Foundation of a future State.

It being then believed, that a Providence was administered, though not with equal Vigour, both here and hereafter; it was natural for them to suppose that the Method might be the same. And as the Way of punishing, in another State, was by a *Transmigration of the Soul*; so in *this*, it was by a *Transformation of the Body*: the Thing being the same, with only a little Difference of Ceremony in the Circumstances: the Soul, in the first Case, going to the Body; and, in the latter, the Body to the Soul: *this* being called the *Metamorphosis*; and *that* the *Metempsychosis*. Thus, both one and the other made a Part of the popular Doctrine of Providence: And Minds, grossly passioned, never want Stories to confirm their Prejudices. What

ages. On y voit des traits desfigurez par ces traditions, mais certainement pris de l'histoire des Israélites sous Moïse & sous Josué.

principally contributed to fix their Belief of the *Metamorphosis* was, in my Opinion, the strange Effects of *Melancholy Habits*. There was a common Distemper, arising from this *Habit*, well known to the Ancients by the Name of the *Lycanthropy*; where the Patient fancied himself turned into a Wolf, or other savage Animal. Why the vitiated Imagination should take this peculiar Ply, is not hard to account for, if we consider that this kind of Transformation made Part of the popular Doctrine of Providence: For the *religious Belief*, we may be assured, would work strongly on a diseased Fancy, racked by a Consciousness of Crimes, to which that *Habit* is naturally obnoxious; and, as it did in the Case of *Nebuchadnezzar*^m, make the Party conclude himself the Object of Divine Justice. And that the vulgar Superstition generally gives the Bias to the Extravagances of a distempered Imagination, we have a familiar Instance: No People upon Earth are more subject to *atrabilaire* Disorders than the *English*: Now while the Tales of Witches, and their Transformations were believed, nothing was commoner in this Distemper, than such fancied Changes by the Power of Witchcraft. But since these Fables lost their Terror, quite different Whimsies, we find, have possessed our melancholic People.

These sickly Imaginations therefore proceeding from the Impressions of the religious Notion of the *Metamorphosis*, would, in their Turn, add great Credit to it; and then any Trifle would keep it up; even an *equivocal Appellation*; which, I don't doubt, hath often given birth to a particular

^m *Daniel's* Prediction of this Monarch's Disgrace, evidently shews it to have been the Effect of divine Vengeance: Yet the Prophet's Account of the Circumstances of this Punishment, seems to shew that it was inflicted by common and natural Means.

Fable, though oftener been made an after Imbellishment to support it.

Thus the *Metamorphosis* arose from the Doctrine of the *Metempsychosis*ⁿ; and was indeed a Species of it, and, of course, a very considerable Part of the Pagan Theology: So that we are not to wonder if several grave Writers made Collections of them; as *Nicander, Boeus, Callisthenes, Dorotheus, Theodorus, Parthenius*, and *Adrian* the Sophist. Of what kind these Collections were, we may see by that of *Antonius Liberalis*, who transcribed from them: Thence *Ovid* gathered his Materials; and formed them into a Poem on the most grand and regular Plan, a popular *History of Providence*; carried down from the Creation to his own Times, through the *Egyptian, Phenician, Greek, and Roman* Histories: And this in as methodical a Manner, as the Graces of Poetry would allow.

And though to enliven his Work, he has followed the Bent of his Nature, in intermixing here and there, stories of the Loves of the Gods, which too their religious Traditions countenanced; yet he always keeps his End in view, by taking Care frequently to remind his Reader, that *those Punishments were inflicted by the Gods for Impiety*. Which appears to have been the usual Strain of the Writers of *Metamorphoses*. "Ἀχαιὺν μὲν ἔν θεῶν ἐτίμων Ὀδυσσεύς ἦσαν^o: So long as they preserved their Piety to the Gods, they were happy, being the constant Prologue to a tragic Story.

But this was not enough: The Poet, jealous as it were, of the secret Dignity of his Composition,

ⁿ The Eastern Fables are full of *Metamorphoses*; and 'tis observable that those People, before they embraced Mahometanism, were Pagans and Believers of the *Metempsychosis*.

^o *Ant. Liberalis. Met. c. 11.*

has towards the Conclusion, given the intelligent Reader a Master-key to his true Drift and Design.

We have observed, that though the *Metempsychosis* was universally taught and believed, and that long before *Pythagoras*; yet the Greatness of his Reputation, and another Cause to be mentioned anon, made it in After-times, to be esteemed his peculiar characteristic Doctrine. Now *Ovid*, by a Contrivance, which for its Justice and Beauty equals any thing in Antiquity, seizes this Circumstance to instruct his Reader in these two important Points: 1. *That his Poem is a popular History of Providence:* And 2. *That the Metempsychosis was the Original of the Metamorphosis.* For in the Conclusion of his Book, he introduces *Pythagoras* teaching and explaining the Transmigration of things to the *Crotoniates*. This was ending his Work in that just philosophic Manner, which the Custom of Antiquity demanded.

The *Abbé Banier* not entering into this beautiful Contrivance, is puzzled^p to account for *Ovid's* bringing in *Pythagoras* so much out of Course. The best Reason he can think of, is, that the Poet having finished the *historical* Metamorphosis, goes on to the *natural*; which *Pythagoras* is made to deliver to the *Crotoniates*. But this is nothing so: The Poet has not finished the *historical* Metamorphosis: For when he has gone through the Episode of the *Crotoniates*, he reassumes his Subject, the *historical* Metamorphosis, through the remaining Part of the last book; which ends with the Change of *Cæsar* into a Comet.

What hath been said will, I presume, tend to give us a different and higher Notion of this extraordinary Poem; and to lessen our Surprise at

^p *Met. de Ovid & des Expl. Hist. Tom. 3.*

the Author's Presumption, in so confidently predicting immortality to his Performance.

“ Jamque opus exegi : quod nec Jovis ira, nec

“ ignis,

“ Nec poterit ferrum, nec edax abolere vetustas.

But to return to our Subject. From what hath been said of *Pythagoras's* Character, it appears, that he taught several Doctrines which he did not believe ; and cultivated Opinions merely on the Score of their Utility. Now we have the express Testimony of *Timæus Locrus*, that, in the Number of these, was the popular Doctrine of the *Metempsychosis*. This very ancient *Pythagorean*, after having said^a, that the inculcating the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, was necessary to Society, goes on in this Manner : — “ For as we
 “ sometimes cure the Body with unwholsome Re-
 “ medies, when such as are most wholsome have no
 “ Effect ; so we restrain those Minds by false Re-
 “ lations, which will not be persuaded by true.
 “ There is a Necessity therefore of instilling the
 “ Dread of those FOREIGN TORMENTS. As that
 “ the Soul shifts and changes its Habitation ; that
 “ the Coward is ignominiously thrust into a Wo-
 “ man's Form ; the Murderer imprisoned within
 “ the Furr of a *Savage* ; the Lascivious condemned
 “ to animate a Boar or Sow ; the Vain and Incon-
 “ stant changed into Birds ; and the Slothful and
 “ Ignorant into Fishes. The Dispensation of all
 “ these things is committed in the second Period,
 “ to *Nemesis* the Avenger ; together with the Fu-
 “ ries, her Assessors, the Inspectors of human A-
 “ ctions ; to whom God, the Sovereign Lord of
 “ all things, hath committed the Government of

^a See the first Sect. of this Book

“ the World, replenished with Gods and Men, and
 “ other Animals; all which were formed after the
 “ perfect Model of the eternal and intellectual
 “ Idea”.

The Testimony is precise; and as this Notion of the *Metempsychosis* was an inseparable Part of the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, if the *Pythagoreans* disbelieved the *one*, they must of Necessity reject the *other*.

But to see the full Force of our Conclusion, it will be necessary to explain, and inforce a Distinction, which by being totally overlooked, has much embarrassed the whole Question.

The Doctrine of the *Metempsychosis*, as it signified a *moral Designation of Providence*, was, as we have said, believed by all Mankind; and originally borrowed from *Egypt*. But *Pythagoras* who had it from thence, with the rest of the World, gave it a different Modification; and made the *old*, the Foundation of a *new* Notion of it; namely, *that the successive Transition of the Soul into other Bodies, was physical and necessary; and exclusive of all moral Considerations whatsoever. This was indeed peculiarly his, and in the Number of the Esoteric Doctrines of his School, delivered to be believed: And what*

Ὡς γὰρ τὰ σώματα νοσώδεσι πόκα υἱιάζομεν, ἕκα μὴ ἔκη τοῖς υἱοποιήταις· οὕτω τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπείρζομεν ψεύδεσι λόγοις, ἕκα μὴ ἀέτῳ ἀλαθίαι· λέγουτο δ' ἀναγκάαις καὶ ΤΙΜΩΡΙΑΙ ΞΕΝΑΙ, ὡς μενδορμήν τῶν ψυχῶν, τῷ μὲν δειλῶν, ἐς γυναικέα σκάνεα, ποθ' ὑδὸν ἐκιδόρμη'· τῷ δὲ μαιφόνων, ἐς θηρίων σώματα, ποθ' κόλασιν· λάτῃ δ', ἐς σοῦν ἢ κάπρων μορφάς· κήφαν δὲ καὶ μελεώρων, ἐς πτηνῶν ἀεζοπόρων· ἀργῶν δὲ καὶ ἀπρωκίων, αἰμαθῶν τε καὶ ἀνθηίων, ἐς τῶν τ' ἐνύδων ἰδεῶν· ἀπαίχῃ δὲ ταῦτα ἐν δούλεα παροδοῖν αἱ Νέμεσις συνδιέκρινε, σὺν δαίμοσι παλαμναίοις χθονίοις τε, τοῖς ἐπόπταις τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. οἷς ὁ πᾶσι ἀγερῶν θεὸς ἐπέτρεψε διοίκησιν κόσμου, συμπληρωρῶν ἐκ θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων, τῷ τε ἄλλων ζώων· ὅσα δεδαμνίσθηται ποτ' εἰκότα τῶν ἀγέστων εἰδὲς αἰώνια καὶ νοητῶν. *De anima mundi, sub. fin.*

more,

more, perhaps, than any other thing, contributed to make the popular Notion of the *Metempsychosis*, in the Sense of a providential Dispensation, to be esteemed his, though this last was common to all; and taught by him, as appears from *Timæus*, amongst the *Exoteric* Doctrines, whose end was Utility, and not Truth.

How destructive this real and peculiarly *Pythagoric* Notion of a *Metempsychosis* was to the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments; *Ovid*, who well understood the Secret of the Distinction, evidently perceived, where he makes *Pythagoras*, in delivering the *Esoteric* Doctrine of his School to the *Crotoniates*, reject a future State of Rewards and Punishments, on the very Principle of his own *Metempsychosis*, though the general *Metempsychosis* was an inseparable Part of that State:

- “ O genus attonitum gelidæ formidine mortis,
 “ Quid Styga, quid tenebras, & nomina vana
 “ timetis,
 “ Materiem vatum, falsique pericula mundi?
 “ Corpora, sive rogos flammâ, seu tæbe vetustas
 “ Abstulerit, mala posse pati non ulla putetis.
 “ Morte carent animæ: *semperque* priore relicta
 “ Sede, novis domibus vivunt, habitantque re-
 “ ceptæ.

The not attending to this Distinction has much perplexed even the best modern Writers on the Subject of *Pythagoras*. Mr. *Dacier* in his Life of that Philosopher, when he comes to speak of the Doctrine of the *Metempsychosis*, advances crudely, that all Antiquity have been deceived in thinking *Pythagoras* really believed it. And for his Warrant, quotes the Passage from *Timæus*, which we have given

given above. Mr. *Le Clerc*¹, scandalized at this Assertion, affirms as crudely, that he did believe it, and endeavours to prove his Point by divers Arguments, and Passages of Antiquity: In which Dispute, neither of them being aware of the two different Sorts of the *Metempsychosis*, have with much Confusion, equally divided the right and the wrong of the Question between them. *Dacier* was surely in the Right, in supposing *Pythagoras* did not believe the *Metempsychosis*, as it is delivered by his Disciple *Timæus*; but in the Wrong to conclude, that therefore, he believed none at all. And *Le Clerc* was in the Right, in thinking he did believe some sort of a *Metempsychosis*; but in the Wrong to maintain, that this sort was the popular moral Notion of it. In a Word, the Proofs *Dacier* brings, conclude only against his believing a moral Transmigration: and those *Le Clerc* opposes, only for his believing a natural one. While neither, as we say, apprehending there were two Kinds, the one common to all, the other peculiar to that Philosopher, they have both run into great Mistakes.

I will beg leave to give one Instance from *Le Clerc*; as it will contribute in general to illustrate our Subject, and at the same Time, give particular Light to the latter Part of the Passage, we have but now quoted from *Timæus*. *Dacier* had urged that Passage, in Proof of *Pythagoras*'s not believing the *Metempsychosis*; and *Le Clerc* the same Passage to prove he did, because the Author in Conclusion expressly affirms, that the Dispensation of the *Metempsychosis* is committed in the second Period to Nemesis the Avenger. "Ἀπάντα ὃ ταῦτα ἐν δόλῳ παροίῳ αἱ Νέμεσις ΣΥΝΔΙΕΚΡΙΝΕ. *Le Clerc* having translated these Words, adds — *J'ai traduit ces dernieres*

¹ *Bibl. Choise, Tom. 10. Art. 2. Sect. 5.*

paroles de Timée mot pour mot, à fin que l'on pût voir qu'il parle sérieusement^c. But whoever reads the whole Passage, which speaks of the Doctrine as *useful* and not *true*, as plainly as Words can do it, will be forced to own that by *Nemesis decrees*, the Author meant, — *it must be taught that Nemesis decrees*. But this Circumstance of *Nemesis* is remarkable; and when explained, will put the Matter out of all Question. There were two kinds as we have said of the *Metempsychosis* which the *Pythagoreans* taught, the *Moral* and the *Natural*. The latter they believed; the first they did not. So that *Timæus* speaking here of the *Metempsychosis* as a Fable, useful for the People to credit; lest the Reader should mistake him as meaning the *natural*, he adds the Circumstance of *Nemesis*, to confine all he said to the *moral Metempsychosis*.

II. PLATO is next in order: He likewise greatly affected the Character of *Law-giver*; and actually composed Laws for several People, as the *Syracusians* and *Cretans*; but with what kind of Spirit we may judge, by his refusing that Employment from the *Thebans* and *Arcadians*, as soon as he understood they were averse to *Equality of Possessions*^d. The Truth is, his *philosophic* Character, which was always predominant, as in *Pythagoras* the *Legislative*, gave his Politics a Cast of Refinement and Speculation, that made his Schemes of Government very impracticable, and even unnatural:

The only *Greek* Masters he followed, were *Pythagoras*, and *Socrates*: both these he much admired. From the first he took his Fondness for Geometry, his Fanaticism of Numbers, his Ambition for Law-giving, and the Doctrine of the *Metempsychosis*.

^c *Bib. Choise, Tom. 10. p. 193.*

^d See *Ælian. Var. Hist. l. 2. c. 42.*

From the latter, the Study of Morals, and *Mode of Disputation*.

This was a monstrous Misalliance : for could any thing be more inconsistent than either the *Character* or the *Philosophy* of his Masters? The *one* dogmatized in the most sublime and abstruse Questions of Nature ; the *other* gave up the *clearest*, and most vulgar, as quite incomprehensible. The *Samian* Legislator aimed only at *Utility*, and the moral *Athenian* laboured after *Truth*.

We need not then any longer wonder at the Obscurity of Contradiction, in which *Plato's* Writings are involved. Which had for its Cause not only what arose from the *double Doctrine*, a thing common to all the Philosophers, but what likewise proceeded from the joint Profession of two so contrary Philosophies. This Effect could not escape the Notice of *Eusebius* — Hear then (says he) the Greeks themselves, by their best and most powerful Speaker, one while rejecting, and another while again adopting the FABLES^w.

However it was the abstruse Philosophy of *Pythagoras*, he was most attached to, for the sake of which, he assumed also the Legislative Part, and in Imitation of his Master, travelled into *Egypt* ; and was initiated into the Mysteries of the Priesthood. It was this that made *Xenophon*, the faithful Follower of *Socrates*, say, that *Plato* had adulterated the pure and simple Philosophy of their Master ; and was IN LOVE with *Egypt*, and the monstrous Wisdom of *Pythagoras*. Αἰσῦπτε ἡγάσθη, ἡ τῆς Πυθαγόρου τελεσιώδους σοφίας.

But of all the *Egyptian Inventions*, and *Pythagoric Practices*, nothing pleased him more than that of

^w Ἄλλοι δ' ἐν αὐτῶν Ἑλλήνων δι' εἰδὸς ἑ παλιν ἀράτε, τότε μὲν ἡμετέριος, τότε δ' ἐν πάλλιν εἰσπορεύει τὸς μυθεῖς. *Præp. Evang.* p. 47. *Steph. Ed.*

the *double Doctrine*, and the Division of his Auditors into the *Exoteric* and *Esoteric* Classes: He more professedly than any other, avowing those Principles, on which that Distinction was founded, such as, — *that it is for the Benefit of Mankind, that they should be often deceived — that there are some Truths it is not fit the People should know — that the World is not to be entrusted with the true Notion of God*: And more openly philosophising upon that Distinction in his Writings: As in his Books of Laws, which we shall see presently were of the *Exoteric* kind, where he defends the popular Opinion which held the Sun, Moon, Stars, and Earth, to be Gods, against the Theory of *Anaxagoras*, that taught the Sun was a Mass of Fire, the Moon an habitable Earth, &c. His great Objection to the *new Philosophy*, as he calls it, being that it was an Inlet to Atheism: For the common People, when they once found those to be no Gods, which they had conceived such, would be apt to conclude there were none at all: And yet in his *Cratylus*, which was of the *Esoteric* kind, laughing at the Ancients for worshipping the Sun and Stars as Gods.

In a Word, the Ancients thought this Distinction of the *double Doctrine*, so necessary a Key to *Plato's* Writings, that they composed Discourses on it. *Numenius*, a *Pythagorean* and *Platonist* both in one, wrote a Treatise (now lost) of the *secret Doctrines*; that is, the real Opinions of *Plato*, *τῶν Πλάτωνος ἀπορρήτων* *; which would probably, have given great Light to our present Question, had it wanted it. But *Albinus* an old *Platonist*, has in some Measure supplied this loss, by his *Introduction to the Dialogues of Plato*†. From whence it appears, that those very Books, in which *Plato*

* Teste Euseb. 1. 13. c. 4, 5. *Præp. Evang.*

† *Apud Fabric. Bib. Græc.* 1. 3. c. 2.

details out the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, are all of the *Exoteric* kind. For in that Class, *Albinus* ranks² the *Criton*, *Phædo*, *Minos*, *Symposium*, *Laws*, *Epistles*, *Epinomis*, *Mexenus*, *Clitophon*, and *Philebus*.

There is an odd Passage in *Cicero*², which seems to regard the *Phædo* in this very Light, of a mere *Exoteric* Composition, as it concerns the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments. The *Auditor* is advised to read the *Phædo*, to confirm his belief in this Point; to which he replies—*fecimehercule, et quidem sæpius: sed nescio quomodo dum lego assentior: cum posui librum, et mecum ipse de immortalitate animorum cæpi cogitare, assentio omnis illa elabitur*. The only reasonable Account I can give of this Reflexion is, that the *Phædo* being an *Exoteric* Dialogue, and wrote for the People, was esteemed by the Learned, as a kind of philosophical Romance: But while a Reader, though in the Secret, is actually intent upon such a Work (if like this, a Master-piece for Style and Composition) he is so captivated with the Charms and *Lenocinium* of those Ornaments, that he forgets for a Moment, the Drift of the Author, and falls into the vulgar Imposition. But having thrown the Book aside, grown cool, and reflected on those Principles concerning God and the Soul, held in common by the Philosophers (of which more hereafter) all the bright Colouring disappears, the real Design obtrudes itself, *et assentio omnis illa elabitur*. A parallel Passage in *Seneca's Epistles*, will explain, and seems to justify this Interpretation. “*Quomodo*
“*molestus est jucundum somnium videnti, qui ex-*
“*citatur: aufert enim voluptatem, etiamsi falsam,*
“*effectum tamen veræ habentem: sic epistola tua*

² Cap. 5.

² *Tusc. Disp.* l. i. c. 11.

“ mihi fecit injuriam; revocavit enim me cogita-
 “ tionis aptæ traditum, et iturum, si licuisset, ul-
 “ terius. Juvabat de æternitate animarum quærere,
 “ imo mehercule credere. *Credebam enim facile o-*
 “ *pinionibus magnorum virorum, rem gratissimam*
 “ *promittentium magis quam probantium!* Dabam me
 “ spei tantæ. Jam eram fastidio mihi, jam reli-
 “ quias ætatis infractæ contemnebam, in immen-
 “ sum illud tempus et in possessionem omnis ævi
 “ transiturus: cum subito experrectus sum, epistola
 “ tua accepta, et tam *bellum somnium* perdi.

The Platonic Philosophy being then entirely Py-
 thagorean in the Point in Question, and this latter
 rejecting the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards
 and Punishments, we might fairly conclude them
 both under the same Predicament.

But as Plato is esteemed the peculiar Patron of
 this Doctrine; chiefly, I suppose, on his being the
 first who brought Reasons for the Eternity of the Soul:
Primum de animorum æternitate non solum sensisse idem
quod PYTHAGORAS, sed RATIONEM etiam attulisse,
 says Tully; on this account, it will be proper to be
 a little more particular.

1. First then, it is very true, that Plato has ar-
 gued much for the Eternity, or, if you will, for
 the Immortality of the Soul. But to know what sort
 of Immortality he meant, we need only consider
 what sort of Arguments he employs. Now these,
 which he was so famous for inventing and enforcing,
 were natural and metaphysical, fetched from the Es-
 sence and Qualities of the Soul; which therefore
 concluded only for its Permanency; and this he cer-
 tainly believed. But for any moral Arguments, from
 which only a future State of Rewards and Punish-
 ments can be deduced, he resolves them all into Tra-
 dition, and the Religion of his Country, *καθ' ἕνα ὁ*

νόμος ὁ πάτερος λέγει, as he expresses it in his *twelfth Book of Laws*.

2. As the inventing Reasons for the Immortality of the Soul, was *one* Cause of his being esteemed the grand Patron of this Belief ; so *another* was his famous Refinement (for it was indeed *his*) of the *natural Metempsychosis*, the peculiar Doctrine of the *Pythagoreans*. This *natural Metempsychosis*, was, as we have said, that *the successive Transition of the Soul into other Bodies was physical and necessary, and exclusive of all moral Designation whatsoever*. Plato, on receiving this Notion from his Master, gave it this additional Improvement, namely, *that those Changes and Transitions were the Purgations of impure Minds, unfit, by Reason of the Pollutions they had contracted, to re-ascend the Place from whence they came, and rejoin that Substance from whence they were discerped ; and consequently, that pure immaculate Souls were exempt from this Transmigration*. Thus Plato's *Metempsychosis* (which was as peculiar his, as the other was *Pythagoras's*) seemed to have something of a moral Designation in it, which his Master's had not ; nor did it like that, necessarily subject all to it, without Distinction ; or for the same Length of time : in this then they differed. But how much they both agreed in excluding the Notion of all future State of Reward and Punishment, will be seen when in the next Section, we come to shew what a kind of Existence it was, that *Pythagoras* and *Plato*, afforded to the Soul, when it had rejoined that universal Substance, from which it was discerped.

3. However it is very true, that in his Writings he much inculcates the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments. But how ? always in the grossest Sense of the Populace. That *the Souls of ill Men descended into Asses and Swine ; — that the Uninitiated lay in Mire and Filth ; — that there were*
three

three Judges of Hell; and talks of *Stix*, *Cocytus*, *Acheron*, &c. and all with so much Seriouſness^b, as shews he had a mind to be believed. But did he himself believe them? we may be assured he did not: for being the most spiritualized of the Philosophers, had he really believed a future State of Rewards and Punishments, he would have refined and purified it, as he did the Doctrine of the Eternity of the Soul, which he certainly believed. But he has as good as told us what he thought of it, in his *Epinomis*; where writing of the Condition of a good and wise Man after Death, he says, of whom, whether I be in jest or in earnest, I constantly affirm, &c.^c And more plainly, in his Commentary on *Timæus*, where he agrees to his Author's Opinion of the FOREIGN TORMENTS.

4. In Confirmation of all this, we observe in the last Place, that the most intelligent of the Ancients, regarded what *Plato* said of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, as said in the *Exoteric* Way to the People, and not believed by himself.

The famous Stoic *Chrysippus*^d, when he blames *Plato*, as not rightly deterring Men from Injustice, by frightful Stories of future Punishments, takes it for granted that *Plato* himself gave no Credit to them: For he turns his Reprehension, not against that Philosopher's wrong Belief, but his wrong Judgment, to imagine such childish Terrors^e could be useful to the Cause of Virtue.

Strabo plainly declares himself of the same Opinion, when speaking of the *Indian Brachmans*, he says, that they had invented Fables in the Manner

^b In his *Gorgias*, *Phædo*, & *Republic*.

^c "Ὁν καὶ δι᾽ ἡμετέρας αἰτίας καὶ ἀποδείξεως ἄμα, &c.

^d *Plut. de Stoic. repug.*

^e Ὡς ἔδδεν ἀποφράσσειν τὰ ἄκρως καὶ τὰ ἀλφειῶς, δι' ὧν τὰ παλαιὰ καὶ κακοχολοῦν αἱ γυναῖκες ἀνέρεσι.

of Plato, concerning the Immortality of the Soul, and a future Judgment; and other things of the same Nature^f.

Celsus owns that all Plato tells us of a future State, and the happy Abodes of the Virtuous, is an Allegory. “But what (says he) we are to understand by these things, is not easy for every one to find out. To be Master of this, we must be able to comprehend his Meaning, when he says, — *they cannot, by Reason of their Imbecillity and Sluggishness, penetrate into the highest Region. But was their Nature vigorous enough to raise itself to so sublime a Contemplation, then would they come to understand, that this was the true Heaven, and the true Irradiation*”. These remarkable Words, besides the general Conclusion to be drawn from them, confirm what we have said of the peculiar Platonic Metempsychosis. For here Celsus resolves all Plato’s Meaning, in his Representations of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, into *that*, and we shall see hereafter, that *that* was resolved into the Reunion of the Soul with the divine Nature, when it became *vigorous enough to penetrate the highest Region*.

^f ὁ δὲ ἀπλάνεσι δὲ καὶ μύθοις, ὥσπερ καὶ ΠΛΑΤΩΝ περὶ τὰ ἀρθρασιας ψυχῆς, καὶ τῆ καθ’ αὐτὴν κρείττων, καὶ ἄλλα τοιαῦτα. Geogr. I. 15. p. 1040. Gron. Ed.

Ἔ τίς ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐμφανίζων, ὃ παντὶ γινώσκων ῥάδιον· εἰ μὴ ὅστις ἐπαίειν δύναται, τί ποῦ ἐστὶ ἐκείνο ὃ φησὶν Ἰπ’ ἀσθενείας καὶ βραδυτήτος· ἔχ’ οὐκ ἔστι διειλεῖν ἐπ’ ἔσχατον τ’ ἀρετῆς καὶ εἰ ἡ φύσις ἰκανὴ εἴη ἀναχέσθαι θεωρεῖσα, γινώσκων αὖτ’ ὃ, τί ἐκείνός ἐστιν ὃ ἀληθὺς ἔργον καὶ τὸ ἀληθινὸν φῶς. Orig. cont. Cels. I. 7. p. 352. Dr. Ed. To understand the ἀληθινὸν φῶς, we must consider that Light was one of the most important Circumstances of the Pagan Elysium, as we may see in the Chapter of the Mysteries; where a certain ravishing and divine Light is represented, as making it so recommendable; according to that of Virgil:

Largior hic campos æther & lumine vestit
Purpureo. —

We

We now come to the *Peripatetics* and *Stoics*, who will give us much less Trouble. For these having in some Degree, though not quite, thrown off the Legislative Character, spoke much opener against a future State of Rewards and Punishments. That the Difference in this Point, between them and the *Platonists*, was only from less to more reserve, appears from their all having the same common Principles of philosophising, as we learn from *Cicero*^h.

III. ARISTOTLE was the Disciple of *Plato*, and his Rival. This though it disposed him to take a different Rout to Fame, in a Province yet unoccupied, and to throw off the Legislative Character; yet this very Emulation set him upon Writing Books of Laws and Politics, in Opposition to his Master; whom he takes every Opportunity to contradict.

He observed indeed the ancient Method of the double Doctrine, but with less Caution and Reserve. For whereas the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonists* kept this Practice amongst the Secrets of their Schools, he seems willing that all the World should take Notice of it, by giving public Directions to distinguish the two Kindsⁱ. Accordingly, in his *Nicomachian Ethics*, he expresses himself without any Ceremony, and in the most dogmatic Way, against a future State of Rewards and Punishments. *Death* (says he) *is of all things the most Terrible. For it is the final Period of Existence. And beyond that, it appears, there is neither good nor evil for the dead Man to dread or hope*^k.

IV. ZENO the Founder of the Porch, followed the Mode in Writing of *Laws*, and a *Republic*;

^h *Acad. Quæst.* 1. 1.

ⁱ See *Cic. Ep. ad Att.* 1. 4. Ep. 16.

^k Φοβερώτατον δ' ὁ θάνατος; πῶς γὰρ καὶ εἶναι τῷ τελευτῶντι δοκεῖ, ὅτε ἀθάτον, ὅτε κακὸν οὐ. *Eth. ad Nicom.* 1. 3. c. 6. p. 131. Ed. *Han.* 1610. 8vo.

agreeably to this part of his Character, we find by *Lactantius*, that he taught a future State of Rewards and Punishments in the very Terms of *Plato*: *Esse inferos Zenon Stoicus docuit; & sedes piorum ab impiis esse discretas; & illos quidem quietas ac delectabiles incolere regiones, hos vero luere pœnas in tenebrosis locis atque in cani voraginibus horrendis*¹. And yet not to mention that his follower *Chrysippus* laughed at these things, as the most childish of all Terrors; we know the philosophic Principle of his School was, *that the Soul died with the Body*^m. Indeed to compliment their *wise Man*, they taught that *his* Soul held it out till the general Conflagration: By which, we shall see they meant just nothing, when we come to speak of their Opinion concerning the Nature and Duplicity of the Soul.

However, it was not long before the *Stoics* quite laid aside the Legislative Character; for which their Master appears to have had no Talent, as we may judge by what he lays down in his *Republic*, — that *States should not busy themselves in erecting Temples; for we ought not to think that there is any thing holy, or sacred, or what deserves any real Esteem, in the Work of Masons and Labourers*ⁿ. The Man had forgot sure that he was writing Laws for a *Community*, while he thus impertinently philosophises to the *Stoical Sage*. The Truth is, this Sect had never any Name for Legislation: And so in time, as we say, laid the Study of it quite aside; and

¹ *Iust.* l. 7. Sect. 7.

^m Οὐδὲν οὖν ἐκείνους τῶν σωματικῶν ἀποδείξασθαι, ὅτι μὴ ἀλλ' ἀποθανόντων αὐτῶν τοῦ σώματος ἀφαιρέσθαι ταῦτα, ὅτι τὸ ἀποθανόντων οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἔτι οὐκ ὄντων. ἀλλὰ ἐστὶν περὶ τοῦ ΣΟΦΟΥΣ, καὶ μέγα τὸ ἐκπαινεῖν. *Plut. de Plac. Phil.* l. 4. c. 7.

ⁿ Περὶ οὗτων δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὅτι καὶ Ζεὺς οὐκ ἐκτίθει ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ οὐδὲν ἵερὸν οὐδὲν ἁγίον μὴ καὶ ὁμοῖον. ὡς οὐ γὰρ ἡδὲν χρὴ τιμίζειν, καὶ πάλιν ἡδὲν καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκδοῦναι καὶ τιμᾶν καὶ βραβεύειν. *Apud Orig. cont. Cell.* p. 6.

then wrote without the least Reserve, against a future State of Rewards and Punishments.

Thus *Epiſtetus*, a thorough Stoic, if ever there was any, speaking of Death, says, “ But whither
“ do you go ? no where to hurt you : You return
“ from whence you came : To a friendly Conso-
“ ciation with your kindred Elements : What their
“ was of the Nature of Fire in your Composition,
“ returns to the Element of Fire ; what their was of
“ Earth, to Earth ; what of Air, to Air ; and of
“ Water, to Water. There is neither *Hell*, *Ache-
“ ron*, *Cocytus*, or *Pyriphlegethon*°.

Seneca, in his Consolation to *Marcia*, Daughter of the famous *Cremutius Cordus* the Stoic, is not at all behind him, in the frank avowal of the same Principles. “ Cogita, nullis defunctum malis affici.
“ Illa quæ nobis Inferos faciunt terribiles, fabulam
“ esse. Nullas imminere mortuis tenebras, nec car-
“ cerem, nec flumina flagrantia igne, nec obli-
“ onis amnem, nec tribunalia, & reos & in illa li-
“ bertate tam laxa ullos iturum Tyrannos. Luse-
“ runt ista poetæ, & vanis nos agitavere terroribus.
“ Mors omnium dolorum et solutio est, et finis :
“ ultra quam mala nostra non exeunt, quæ nos in
“ illam tranquillitatem, in qua, antequam nascere-
“ mur, jacuimus, reponit^p.

Having gone through these four famous Schools, I should here have closed the Section, but that I imagined the curious Reader would be desirous to know what *Cicero* thought on this important Question. *Cicero*, who finished the Conquests of his Countrymen in *Greece*, and brought home in

° — Πῦρ, εἰς ὃδὲν δεινόν, ἀλλ' ὅθεν ἐρχόμεθα, εἰς τὰ φίλα καὶ συγγενῆ,
εἰς τὰ συγγενῆ ὅσον ἦν ἐν τοῖς πατρὶ, εἰς πατρὶ ἀπεισιν, ὅσον ἦν γένει.
εἰς γένειον ὅσον πανδυνατίῃ, εἰς πανδυνατίον ὅσον ὑδάτιν, εἰς ὑδάτιον
ἐλθεῖς Ἀθῆναι, ἐδ' Ἀχέραν, ἐδὲ Κωκυλὸς, ἐδὲ Πυριφλεγέθων. *Arrian*
Arrian. l. 3. c. 13.

^p Cap. 12.

Triumph, the only Remains of their Grandeur; their Philosophy and Eloquence⁹. The Difficulty, in getting to the real Sentiments of this prodigious Man, is so very great, that I might be well excused, if I declined this Enquiry, and left it to be determined, as, I will venture to foretell the Public, every Question that regards *Cicero*, will be with the utmost Precision, by an excellent Author, from whom we may shortly expect *the Life* of this illustrious *Roman*: but as *Cicero's* Opinion has a near relation to our Question, we will endeavour to discover it.

There are, as we said, almost insuperable Difficulties in getting to his real Sentiments. I shall mention some of the chief.

1. As, first, that which arises from the Practice of the *Double Doctrine*, a Thing common to all the *Greek* Philosophy; how much it contributed to hide the real Sentiments of the Writer, we have seen above. That *Tully* followed this Method, appears from his Letters to *Atticus*¹; where he calls *Plato*, who was most immersed in it, his *God*, *Deus ille noster Plato*.

2. Another Difficulty arises from the peculiar Genius of the Sect he espoused, namely, the *new Academy*; which, as we have seen above, was entirely *sceptical*; and professed a Way of philosophising, in which there was no room either to *interfere* with their own Opinions, or indeed to *have* any. It is true, was we to consider *Tully* as a *strict Academic*, in the *Grecian* Sense of adhering to a Sect, our Enquiry would be at an End; or as ri-

⁹ — Τὸν δ' Ἀπολλώνιον — ἠπᾶν, Σὲ μὲν, ὦ Κικέρων, ἱπανῶ καὶ θαυμάζω, τὴν δ' Ἑλλάδα οὐκ αἶρω τὴν τύχην, ὅρων, ὅ μόνον τῶν καλῶν καὶ ὑπερκατεῖ, καὶ ταῦτα Ῥωμαίοις ἀπὸ σὺ προσηνόμενα, ΠΑΙΔΕΙΑΝ τε καὶ ΛΟΓΟΝ. *Plut. vit. Cic.*

¹ L. 4. Ep. 16.

diculous as to search for a blind Man's Judgment of Colours: but he professed this Philosophy in a much laxer Way, as we shall now see.

3. Which leads us to another Difficulty, arising from the Manner, in which the Greek Philosophy was received in *Italy*. The *Romans* were in their Manners and Dispositions little qualified for speculative Sciences: When they had got footing, and established the Commerce of Arts in *Greece*, they at first entertained great Jealousies of their Sophists, and used them roughly: And it was long before they could be persuaded to think favourably of Men, who professed themselves always able and ready to dispute for or against Virtue indifferently. And even then, their Philosophy was introduced into *Rome*, but as a more refined Species of Luxury. The *Romans* being far from the *Grecian* Humour, *jurare in verba Magistri*, they regarded the Doctrines of the Sect they espoused, not as a *Rule of Life*; but only as a kind of Furniture for their Rhetoric Schools; to enable them to invent readily, and reason justly in Affairs of Life. *Tully*, who best knew on what footing it was received, where he ridicules *Cato* for an unfashionable Fellow, tells us this: *Hæc homo ingeniosissimus M. Cato auctoribus eruditissimis inductus, arripuit, NEQUE DISPUTANDI CAUSA, UT MAGNA PARS, sed ita vivendi*¹. The least, then, we may conclude from

¹ *Orat. pro Muræ.* It must be owned, that these Words at first sight seem to have a quite different Signification; namely, that the particular Principles of the Stoics were espoused for their Use in Disputation: For it is to be observed, that this Sect was most famous for cultivating the Art of Logic; so that the Followers of it were more frequently called *Dialectici* than *Stoici*. Notwithstanding I am persuaded the other Sense is the true. *Tully* introduces his Observation on *Cato's* Singularity in these Words: "Et quoniam non est nobis hæc oratio habenda aut cum imperita multitudine, aut in aliquo conventu agrestium, audacius paulo
de

from hence is, that *Tully*, laughing at those who espoused a Sect *vivendi causa*, did himself espouse the *Academic*, *disputandi causa*: which indeed he frankly enough confesses to his Adversary, in this very Oration: “*Fatebor enim Cato, me quoque*” “*in adolescentia, diffusum ingenio meo, quæsisse adju-*” “*menta doctrinæ.*” Which, in other Words, is, I myself espoused a Sect of Philosophy, for its Use in Disputation. This slippery Way, therefore, of professing the *Greek* Philosophy, must needs add much to the Difficulties of getting to the Writer’s real Sentiments.

4. A fourth Difficulty arises from *Tully’s* End and Design in writing his Philosophical Works; which was, not to deliver his own Opinion on any Point, but to explain to his Countrymen, in the most intelligible manner, whatsoever the *Greeks* had taught on every Article, whether of speculative or practical Knowledge: in the Execution of which Design, no Sect could so well serve his purpose as the New Academy, whose Principle was, *not to interfere with their own Opinions*: And a Passage, in the first Book of his *Academic Questions*, inclines me to think, he then espoused it, when he first entered on that Design. *Varro*, one of the Dialogists says to him: — *Sed de teipso quid est quod audio?* *Tully* answers, *Quanam de re?* *Varro* re-

“*de studiis humanitatis, quæ & mihi & vobis nota & jucunda*” “*sunt, disputabo.*” Here he expressly declares that his Design is, not to give his Thoughts of the *Stoics* in particular, though they furnished the Occasion; but of the *Greek* Philosophy in general, *de studiis humanitatis*. He then enumerates the *Stoical Paradoxes*, and concludes — *Hæc homo ingeniosissimus M. C.* — *arripuit, &c.* But had it been his Intention to have confined the Observation above to the *Stoical* Sect, on account of their great Name in Logic, he must have said *hanc*, not *hæc*: it being their *Logic*, not their *Paradoxes*, that was of use in their *Disputations*.

plies,

plies, *Relictam a te VETEREM JAM, tractari autem NOVAM.* The Change then was late; and after the Ruin of the Republic, when Cicero had Leisure, in his Recess, to project that grand Design: So that a learned Critic appears to have been mistaken, when he supposed, this Choice was made in his Youth. *This Sect*, says he [namely, the New Academy] *did best agree with the vast Genius and ambitious Spirit of YOUNG Cicero*^t.

5. But the principal Difficulty arises from the several various Characters he sustained in Life, and in his Writings; that habituated him to feign and dissemble his Opinions: in which, though he acted neither a weak nor unfair Part, yet certainly a very impenetrable one, with regard to his own Opinions. He may be considered under the Characters of an Orator, a Statesman, and a Philosopher; all equally *personated*; and no one more the real Man, than the other: but each taken up, and laid down, for the Occasion: as appears by the numerous Inconsistencies he maintained in the Course of his sustaining them. In his Oration *de Harusp. respon. in Senatu*, when the popular Superstition was inflamed by present Prodigies, he gives the highest Character of the Wisdom of their Ancestors, as the Founders of the Established Religion: *Ego verò primum habeo auctores ac magistros religionum colendarum majores nostros: quorum mihi tanta fuisse sapientia videtur, ut satis superque prudentes sint; qui illorum prudentiam, non dicam assequi, sed, quanta fuerit, perspicere possint.* Yet in his Treatise of *Laws*, as the Reader has seen above^u, he frankly declares, that the Folly of their Ancestors had suffered many Depravities to be brought into Religion. Here

^t Remarks upon a late Discourse of Free-thinking, Part 2. Rem. 53.

^u See Book II. Sect. 6.

the Philosopher confuted the Statesman; as, in another Instance, the Statesman seems to have got the better of the Philosopher. He defends the Paradoxes of the Stoics in a Philosophical Dissertation: But in his Oration for *Muræna*, he ridicules those Paradoxes in the freest manner. Nor under one and the same Character, at one and the same Time, is he more consistent: In *the Orations against Catiline*, when he speaks of the Conspiracy to the Senate, he represents it as the most deep laid Design, that had infected all Orders and Degrees of Men amongst them: Yet, when he opens the same Affair to the People, he speaks of it as only the wild and dissolute Frolic of a few senseless Desperadoes; it being necessary for his Purpose, that the Senate and People should view the Conspiracy in those two different Lights.

We meet with Numbers of the like Contradictions, delivered in his own Person, under his Philosophic Character. Thus, in his *Books of Divination*, he combats all Augury, &c. And yet, in his Philosophic *Treatise of Laws*, he delivers himself in favour of their Truth, in so serious and positive a manner, that it is difficult not to believe him in earnest. In a Word, he laughed at the Opinions of the State, when he was amongst the Philosophers; he laughed at the Doctrines of the Philosophers, when he was cajoling an Assembly; and he laughed heartily at both when withdrawn amongst his Friends in a Corner: nor, which is the worst Part of the Story, has he given us any Mark to distinguish his Meaning: For, in his *Academic Questions*^w, he is ready to swear he always speaks what he thinks: — *Jurarem per Jovem Dediſque Penates me & ardere studio veri reperiendi,*

^w Lib. 4. Sect. 20.

Et ea sentire quæ dicerem. Yet, in his *Nature of the Gods*^x, he has strangely changed his Note: *Qui autem requirunt, quid quaque de re ipsi sentiamus, curiosius id faciunt quam necesse est.*

If it be asked then, in which of his Writings we have any reasonable Assurance of his real Sentiments? I reply, scarce in any but his *Epistles*. Nor is this said to enervate any strong Evidence that may be found in his other Works, in favour of a future State of Rewards and Punishments: On the contrary, there are many very signal Instances of his Disbelief, as far as we can hazard a Judgment of his Mind: as in his *Offices*, which bids the fairest of any to be spoke from his Heart, he delivers himself to purpose against it; as will appear in the next Section. And in his Oration for *Cluentius* to the Judges, he speaks with yet more Force for the contrary Opinion: — “ Nam nunc “ quidem quid tandem illi mali mors attulit? nisi “ forte ineptiis ac fabulis ducimur, ut existimemus, “ illum apud inferos impiorum supplicia perferre, “ &c. *Quæ si falsa sunt, id quod omnes intelli-* “ *gunt, quid ei tandem aliud mors eripuit præter sen-* “ *sum doloris.*” I would only desire the Reader to observe, that the Argument in the latter Part of the Period proves *this*, at least, if it proves no more, that we have not concluded amiss, when, from several Quotations interspersed throughout this Work, in which a Disbelief of the common Notion of a future State of Rewards and Punishments is implied, we have inferred the Writer’s Disbelief of the Doctrine in general.

Nor will most of *those* Passages, which are usually brought in proof of Tully’s believing the *Immortality of the Soul*, stand in any account against

^x Lib. 1. Sect. 5.

these: because, as will be shewn in the next Section, they best agree to a *kind of Immortality* very consistent with a thorough Disbelief of a future State of Rewards and Punishments.

It is only then (as we say) in his Epistles to his Friends, where we see the *Man* divested of the *Politician* and the *Sophist*: And there he professes his Disbelief of a future State of Rewards and Punishments in the frankest manner. In his Epistle to *Torquatus*^y, he says: — “Sed hæc consolatio
“levis est; illa gravior, qua te uti spero: ego
“certe utor. Nec enim dum ero, angar ulla re
“cum omni vacem culpa: *etsi non ero, sensu omnino*
“*carebo.*” Again, to the same Person^z: — “De-
“inde quod mihi ad consolationem commune te-
“cum est, si jam vocar ad exitum vitæ, non ab
“ea Republica avellar, qua carendum esse doleam,
“*præsertim cum id sine ullo sensu futurum sit.*” And
again to his Friend *Toranius*^a: — “Cum consilio
“profici nihil possit, una ratio videtur, quicquid
“e venerit, ferre moderate, *præsertim cum omnium*
“*rerum mors sit extremum.*” That *Cicero* here
speaks his real Sentiments, is beyond all question.
These are Letters of Consolation to his Friends,
when he himself, by reason of the ill State of public
Affairs, much wanted Consolation: A Season
when Men have least Disguise, and are most dis-
posed to lay open their whole Hearts.

“Nam veræ voces tum demum pectore ab imo

“Ejiciuntur, & eripitur PERSONA manet RES.

Lucret.

I will beg Leave to conclude this Section with
one general Observation on the whole. We have

^y Lib. 6. cap. 3.

^z Lib. 6. Ep. 4.

^a Lib. 6. Ep. 21.

seen the Philosophers, of every Sect, one while speaking directly for, and another while, as directly against a future State of Rewards and Punishments, without intimating the least Change in their Principles, or making the least Hesitation in their Professions: So that either we must hold them guilty of the most gross and visible Contradictions, which their Characters will not suffer us to conceive of them; or else admit the Explanation given above of the *Double Doctrine*, and the different Methods of their exoteric and esoteric Discipline.

SECT. IV.

NOTWITHSTANDING the full Evidence of the last Section, I suspect, the *general Prejudice* supported by the Reasonableness of the *Doctrine* itself, will yet be apt to make the Reader suspend his assent to our Conclusion.

I shall therefore, in the last place, explain the CAUSES that kept the Philosophers from *believing*: which will appear to have been fundamental Principles of the ancient *Greek* Philosophy; and altogether inconsistent with the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments.

But to give what we have to say its due Force, it will be proper to premise, that the Constitution of the *Greek* Philosophy, being above measure refined and speculative; it used always to be determined by *metaphysical* rather than by *moral* Principles, and to stick to all Consequences, how absurd soever, that were seen to arise from such Principles.

Of this, we have a famous Instance in the ancient *Democritic* Philosophy: which holding, that not only *Sensations*, but even the *Cogitations* of the Mind, were the mere Passion of the Thinker; and
so,

so, all Knowledge and Understanding the same Thing with Sense ; the Consequence was, that there could not possibly be any Error of false Judgment ; because all Passion was true Passion, and all Appearance true Appearance. From hence it followed, that the Sun and Moon were no bigger than they seemed : and these Men of Reason chose rather to avow this Consequence, than renounce the metaphysical Principle that led them to it.

So well supported, we see, is that Censure which a celebrated *French* Writer passes upon them : — *Quand les philosophes s'entêtent une fois d' un préjugé, ils sont plus incurables que le peuple même ; parce qu' ils s'entêtent également & du préjugé & des fausses raisons dont ils le soutiennent*^b.

The Reverence and Regard to metaphysical Principles being so great, we shall see, that the *Greek* Philosophers must of Necessity reject the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, how many admirable moral Arguments forever there be in support of it, when we come to shew, that there were two METAPHYSICAL PRINCIPLES concerning GOD and the SOUL, universally embraced by all, which directly overthrow this whole Notion of a future State.

The first Principle then, which led the Philosophers to conclude against a future State of Rewards and Punishments, was this : THAT GOD COULD NEITHER BE ANGRY NOR HURT ANY ONE : Which *Tully* assures us was held universally, as well by those who believed a Providence, as by those who did not : — *At hoc quidem commune est omnium philosophorum, non eorum modo qui Deum nihil habere ipsum negotii dicunt, & nihil exhibere alteri : sed eorum etiam qui Deum semper*

^b Fontanelle. *Hist. des Oracles.* ^c *Offic. Lib. 3. cap. 28.*

agere aliquid & moliri volunt, NUMQUAM NEC IRASCI DEUM NEC NOCERE^c. What Conclusions follow from this Principle, against a future State of Rewards and Punishments, in the Opinion of Cicero himself, we shall now see. He is here commending *Regulus* for preferring the Public Good to his own; and, the *honest*, to the *profitable*; in dissuading the Release of the *Carthaginian* Prisoners, and returning back to certain Misery, when he might have spent his Age at home in Peace and Pleasure. All this he observes was done out of regard to his Oath. But it may, perhaps, says he, be objected, — What is there in an Oath? The Violator need not fear the Wrath of Heaven; for all Philosophers hold, that *God cannot be angry or hurt any one*. He replies, that, indeed, it was a Consequence of the Principle of *God's not being angry*, that the perjured Man had nothing to fear from divine Vengeance: but then it was not this *Fear*, which was really nothing, but Justice and good Faith, that made the Sanction of an Oath. The Learned will chuse to hear him in his own Words: — “ M. Atilius Regulus Karthaginem re-
 “ diit: neque eum caritas patriæ retinuit, nec suo-
 “ rum. Neque vero tum ignorabat se ad crude-
 “ lissimum hostem, & ad exquisita supplicia profi-
 “ cisci: sed jusjurandum servandum putabat. Quid
 “ est igitur dixerit quis in jurejurando? num ira-
 “ tum timemus Jovem? At hoc quidem commune
 “ est omnium Philosophorum — NUMQUAM NEC
 “ IRASCI DEUM, NEC NOCERE. — Hæc quidem
 “ ratio non magis contra Regulum, quàm contra
 “ omne jusjurandum valet: Sed in jurejurando, non
 “ qui metus, sed quævis sit, debet intelligi: est
 “ enim jusjurandum affirmatio religiosa. Quod
 “ autem affirmatè, quasi Deo teste, promiseris, id
 “ tenendum est: jam enim non ad iram Deorum,

“*quæ nulla est; sed ad justitiam & ad fidem pertinet*.”^d

Here we see *Tully* owns the Consequence of this universal Principle; that it quite overthrew the Notion of divine Punishments: and it will appear presently, that he was not singular in this Conclusion; but spoke the very Sense of his *Greek Masters*.

A modern Reader, full of the philosophic Ideas of these late Ages, will be surprized, perhaps, to be told that this Consequence greatly embarrassed Antiquity; when he can so easily evade it, by distinguishing between human Passions and the Divine Attributes of Justice and Goodness: On which latter alone the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments is invincibly established. But the Ancients had no such precise Ideas of the Divine Nature: they knew not how to sever *Anger* from its Justice, nor *Kindness* from its Goodness^e.

This we shall now shew, by an illustrious Instance; lest the Reader should suspect that, of an obscure speculative Principle, we have made *one* of universal Credit and Influence.

LACTANTIUS having set up for the Defender of Christianity, found nothing so much opposed its Reception, as the Doctrine of a FUTURE JUDGMENT, which the universal philosophic Principle,

^d Cap. 26, 27, 28, 29.

^e The acutest Enemies of Religion amongst the Moderns too have thought this Argument strong enough to rest their Cause upon; as appears from the following Words of Bishop Burnet: — He [the Earl of Rochester] believed there was a Supreme Being: He could not think the World was made by Chance, and the regular Course of Nature seemed to demonstrate the eternal Power of its Author. — He thought that God had none of those Affections of Love and Hatred, which breed Perturbation in us; and by consequence he could not see that there was to be either Reward or Punishment. Some Pass. of the Life and Death of John E. of Rochester, p. 47.

that God could not be angry, had altogether discredited. To strike then at the Root of this Evil, he compos'd his Discourse entitul'd DE IRA DEI : For he had observ'd, he tells us, that this Principle was now much spread amongst the common People, *Animadverti plurimos existimare non irasci Deum* ; and lays the Blame of it upon the Philosophers, *iidem tamen a Philosophis irretiti, & falsis argumentationibus capti* : And tells us, as Tully had done before, that all the Philosophers agreed to exclude the Passion of Anger from the Godhead. *Ita omnes Philosophi de ira consentiunt.*

So that the general Argument *Lactantius* propos'd to combat, was this :

If God hath no Affections of Fondness or Hatred, Love or Anger ; He cannot reward or punish. But he hath no Affections ; — Therefore, &c.

Let us see then how he manages ; who although he knew but little of Christianity, yet was exquisitely well skill'd in the strong and weak Side of Philosophy. A modern Opponent would certainly have denied the *Major* : but *that* was a Principle received by all Parties, as *Lactantius* himself gives us to understand, when he says that the Principle, of God's not being angry, destroyed all Religion, by taking away a future State : *Qui sine ira Deum esse credentes, dissolvunt omnem Religionem — Sive igitur gratiam Deo, sive iram, sive utrumque detraxeris, religionem tolli necesse est.* — He had nothing left then but to deny the *Minor* : And this, he tells us, is the Subject of his undertaking : *Hæc [nempe ut irascatur Deus] tuenda nobis, & afferenda sententia est : in ea enim summa omnis, & cardo religionis pietatisque versatur.*

His Business then is to prove, that God has human Passions: and though, by several Expressions dropped up and down, he seems to be fully sensible of the Grossness of his Conclusion; yet, on the other hand, all Philosophy agreeing to make *this* the necessary Support of a future State; he sets upon his Task in good earnest, avoids all Refinements, and maintains that there is in God, as there is in Man, the Passions of *Love* and *Hatred*. These indeed are of two kinds in Man, *reasonable* and *unreasonable*; but, in God, the first kind only is to be found. To prevent being misunderstood, and to provide a proper Subject for these Passions, he contends strongly for God's *having a human Form*: No discreditable Notion, at that time, in the Church; and which, if I might be indulged a Conjecture, I would suppose was first introduced for that very purpose, to which *Lactantius* here inforces it.

But it is very observable, that our Author introduces this monstrous Notion of *God's having a Human Form*, with an artful Attempt, supported by all his Eloquence, to discredit *Human Reason*; so as the Reader may be disposed to take his Word, that nothing can be known of God but by *Revelation*. This is an old Trick of the Disputers of all Times, to make Reprisals upon Reason; which when found too stubborn to yield, must be represented as too weak to judge. And when once we find an Author, who would be valued for his Logic, begin with depreciating Reason; we may be assured he has some very unreasonable Paradox to advance^f. What

^f So when the learned *Huetius* would pass upon his Readers a Number of slight chimerical Conjectures, for *Demonstrations*, he introduces his Work by cavilling at the Certainty of the Principles of Geometry; with the Cunning of that famous Sign-painter,

What hath been said will, I suppose, not only justify the Consequence we draw from this universal Principle; namely, that it quite overturned the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments; but will also impart considerable Light to a Treatise, in itself, not the most intelligible.

I. But it may be objected, perhaps, that this Principle, of *God's not being angry*, only concluded against a future State of *Punishments*, and not of *Rewards*: many of the Philosophers holding the Affection of *Grace and Favour*; though they all denied that of *Anger*; as *Lactantius* expressly assures us: *Ita omnes philosophi de ira consentiunt, de gratia discrepant.* To this we reply,

1. That, when the Sanction of *Punishment* is taken off, the greatest Influence of a future State is destroyed. For while the Ancients made the Rewards of *Elysium* only temporary,

Has omnes ubi mille rotam volvere per annos, &c.

they made the Punishments of *Tartarus* eternal.

Sedet, æternumque sedebit

Infelix Theseus

This *Plato* teaches us in several Places of his Works^s. And *Celsus* is so far from rejecting it, that he ranks it in the Number of those Doctrines which should

B b 3

never

in *Plutarch*, who having drawn what he called a Cock, drove away all real Cocks, that they might not discredit his Counterfeit.

^s "Οι δ' ἂν δόξωσι ἀνάτως ἔχειν, ἂλ' τὰ μεγέθη τῶ ἀμαρτυμάτων, ἢ ἱερουσίας πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας, ἢ φόνους ἀδίκους καὶ ἀδύνατους πολλὰς ἐξεργασσάμενοι, ἢ ἄλλα ὅσα τιχάνει ὄντι πικρὰ, τίττες δ' ἢ πορροῦντα μοῖρα ῥίπτει εἰς τὸ Τάρταρον, ὅθεν ἔπειτα ἐκταίνονται. *Phædo*, p. 113. — "Ἄλλοι δ' οἰνάν, ἢ οἱ τέττα; ὁρῶντες ἂλ' τὰ ἀναρχίας τὰ μέγιστα καὶ ὀδυνηρότατα ἐφ' ὁστέρωτα παύει παρρησίαν; τὰ αἰσχρότατα. *Gorgias*, p. 525.

never be abandoned, but maintained to the very last ^h.

It is true, that, to what we say against the *Eternity of Rewards*, several Passages of Antiquity may be objected, as this of *Tully*: *Omnibus qui patriam conservarint, adjuverint, auxerint, certum esse in cælo definitum locum, ubi beati ÆVO SEMPITERNO fruantur*ⁱ. But we are to know, that the Ancients (as will be explained hereafter) distinguished the Souls of Men into three Species: the *human*, the *heroic*, and the *demonic*. The *two last*, when they left the Body, were, indeed, believed to enjoy eternal Happiness, for their public Services on Earth; not in *Elysium*, but in *Heaven*: where they became a kind of Demy-gods. But all, of the *first*, which included the great Body of Mankind, were understood to have their Designation in *Purgatory*, *Tartarus*, or *Elysium*: the *first* and *last* of which Abodes were *temporary*; and the *second* only *eternal*. Now those who had greatly served their Country, in the manner *Tully* there mentions, were supposed to have Souls of the *heroic* or *demonic* Kind.

2. But secondly, in every Sense of a future State, as a moral Designation, Rewards and Punishments necessarily imply each other: So that where one is wanting, the other cannot possibly subsist. This is too evident to need a Proof; or not to be seen by the ancient Philosophers: as appears from *Laëtantius*, who in this Treatise takes it as a Thing granted, on all Hands, that the denying God's At-

^h Τῶν μὲν γὰρ θεῶν νομίζουσιν, ὡς οἱ μὲν δὲ βιώσαντες οὐδ' αἰμονήσασιν, οἱ δ' ἄδικοι πάντων αἰώνως κακούς σκεύουσιν. καὶ τότε ἡ δόγματι μήθ' ἔστι, μήτ' ἄλλ' αἰσώπων μηδὲς ποῖς ἀποσῇ, ἀποτέμνους, Apud Orig. cont. Cels. lib. 8.

ⁱ Somn. Scip. cap. 3.

tribute of *Anger* overturns a future State, by taking away the Punishments of it.

3. But lastly, we shall shew under the next Head, to which we are going, that the Philosophers, who held the Attribute of *Grace and Favour* in the Deity, meant it not as a *Passion or Affection*, in which Sense they understood the *Anger*, that was denied by them.

II. As the foregoing Objection would insinuate that the universal Principle, of *God's not being angry*, does not prove *enough*; so the next pretends that it proves *too much*: For, secondly, it may be objected, that this Principle destroys God's Providence *here*, as well as a future State of Rewards and Punishments *hereafter*, which Providence several of the Theistical Philosophers we know did believe.

To this we reply as follows.

Lactantius says, *Omnes philosophi de ira consentiunt, de gratia discrepant*: And taking it for granted, that they considered the *gratia*, which they held, as well as the *ira*, which they denied, to be a *Passion or Affection*, he thus argues, with the utmost Force, against them: “ Si Deus non irascitur impiis & injustis, nec pios utique justosque diligit: ergo constantior est error illorum, qui & iram simul, & gratiam tollunt. In rebus enim diversis, aut in utramque partem moveri necesse est, aut in neutram. Itaque qui bonos diligit, & malos odit; & qui malos non odit, nec bonos diligit: quia & diligere bonos, ex odio malorum venit; & malos odisse, ex bonorum caritate descendit.” But, methinks, the Absurdity of this should have taught *Lactantius*, that the Philosophers, who had rejected *Anger* because it was an human Passion, could never give their God another human Passion: For though they sometimes

philosophised like *Madmen*, they never reasoned like *Idiots*; and though their Principles were often wrong, they always argued from them consequentially. He should therefore have seen, that those, who held the *gratia* on Benevolence of the divine Nature, considered it not as a *Passion* or *Affection*, but as an *Efflux* from its *Essence*; on which they built their Notion of a general Providence. So that when he says, *de gratia discrepant*, we are to understand no more, than that some of them held a Providence, while others denied it.

Let us see then what kind of Providence the Theistical Philosophers believed. The *Peripatetics* and *Stoics* went pretty much together in this Matter. It is commonly imputed to *Aristotle*, that he held no Providence at all to be extended lower than the Moon: but this is a Calumny that *Chalcidias* raised of him. What *Aristotle* evidently meant by the Words, which gave a handle to it, was this, *that a particular Providence did not extend itself to Individuals*: For being a Fatalist in natural Things, and at the same time maintaining Free Will in Man, he thought, if Providence was to be extended to Individuals, it would either impose a Necessity on human Actions, or, being employed on mere Contingencies, might be frequently frustrated in its Designs; which would imply Impotency: and not seeing any Way to reconcile Free Will and Prescience, he cut the Knot by denying that Providence extended to Individuals. *Zeno* held the same kind of Providence, *that the human Species was the Care of Heaven, but in the same Sense as the celestial Orbs are*: And, more consistently with himself, denied Free Will in Man: which was the only Difference between him and *Aristotle*.

Here.

Here then is a Providence very consistent with a Disbelief of a future State of Rewards and Punishments; nay, almost destructive of it.

But now the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonists* will not be put off so: They held a particular Providence, extending itself to each Individual: a Providence, which, according to ancient Notions, could not possibly be administered without the *Affections of Love and Anger*. Here then lies the Difficulty: These Sects removed all Passions from the Godhead, especially *Anger*, and, on that account, rejected a future State of Rewards and Punishments; while yet they believed a Providence, which was administered by the Exercise of those very Passions. For the true Solution of this Difficulty, we must have recourse to a prevailing Principle of Paganism, often before hinted at for the clearing up many Obscurities in Antiquity, I mean that of *Local Tutelary Deities*. *Pythagoras* and *Plato* were great Espousers and Propagaters of the Doctrine which taught, that the several Regions of the Earth were delivered over by the Creator of the Universe to the Vicegerency and Government of inferior Gods. This Opinion, as we shall shew in the next Book, was originally *Egyptian*; on whose Authority these two Philosophers received it; though it had been long the popular Belief all over the Pagan World. Hence, we see the Writings of the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonists* so full of the *Doctrine of Demons*: which was, indeed, the distinguishing Characteristic of the Theology of those Sects. Now these *Demons* were ever supposed, to have *Passions and Affections*, by which alone, as we said, the Ancients understood a particular Providence could be administered. And here it is worthy our Observation, that *Chalcidias* gives *this* as the very Reason why the *Peripatetics* rejected a particular Providence;

dence; namely because they held nothing of the Administration of inferior Deities. His Words are these: *Aristoteles Dei providentiam usque ad Lunæ regionem progredi censet: infra vero neque providentiæ scitis regi, nec angelorum ope consultisque sustentari: nec vero Dæmonum prospicientiam putat intervenire*^k. So closely conjoined in the Opinion of this Writer, whom *Fabricius* calls *gnarissimus veteris Philosophiæ*^l, was the Doctrine of a particular Providence, and that of Demons and subaltern Deities.

But when now the Soul is disengaged from the Body, it is no longer, in their Opinion, under the Government of Demons, nor consequently subject to the Effects of the Demonic Passions. And what becomes of it then, we shall see hereafter. A very remarkable Passage in *Apuleius*, will fully explain and justify the Solution here given. “God (*says this Author*) cannot undergo any temporary Exercise of his Power or Goodness: and therefore cannot be affected with Indignation or Anger; be depressed with Grief, or elated with Joy. But, being free from all the Passions of the Mind, he neither sorrows, nor exults; nor makes any instantaneous Resolution to act, or to forbear acting. Every thing of this kind suits only the middle Nature of the *Demons*. For they are placed between Gods and Men, as well in the Frame and Composition of their Minds, as in the Situation of their abodes, having Immortality in common with the former, and *Affections* in common with the latter. For they are subject, like us, to be every Way irritated and appeased: so as to be inflamed by Anger, melted by Compassion, allured by Gifts, softened by Prayers, ex-

^k *Com. in Platonis Timæum.*

^l *Bib. Lat. l. 3. c. 7.*

“asperated by Neglect, and soothed again by Ob-
 “servance. In a Word, to be affected by every
 “thing that can make Impression on the human
 “Mind^m.

On the whole then it appears, that the Principle of *God's not being angry*, which subverted the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, did not at all affect a particular Providence here: And that the *gratia*, which some of them left the Deity, was no Passion or Affection, like the *ira*, which they took away; but only a *simple Benevolence*, which in the Construction of the Universe, was directed to the best, but did not interfere to prevent Disorders in particular Systems. A Benevolence too, that went not from the *Will*, but the *Essence* of the Supreme Being. So *Seneca* informs us: “*Quæ causa est Diis bene faciendi?*
 “*NATURA.* Errat, si quis putat illos nocere velle:
 “non possunt. Nec accipere injuriam queunt, nec
 “facere; lædere etenim lædique conjunctum est;
 “summa illa ac pulcherrima omnium natura, quos
 “periculo exemit, nec periculosos quidem fecit”.

II. We proceed now, to the *other Cause* that kept the Philosophers from believing a future State of Rewards and Punishments: As the first

^m — Debet Deus nullam perpeti vel operis vel amoris temporalem perfuctionem; et idcirco nec indignatione nec ira contingi, nullo angore contrahi, nullâ alacritate gessere: sed ab omnibus pallionibus animi liber, nec dolere unquam, nec aliquando lætari, nec aliquid repentinum velle vel nolle. Sed et hæc cuncta, ut id genus cætera, Dæmonum mediocritati congruunt. Sunt enim inter homines & deos, ut loco regionis, ita ingenio mentis interfusi, habentes communem cum superis immortalitatem, cum inferis passionem. Nam perinde ut nos, pati possunt omnia animorum placamenta vel incitamenta; ut et irâ incitentur, et misericordiâ flectantur, et donis invitentur, & precibus leniantur, et contumeliis exasperentur, & honoribus mulceantur, aliisque omnibus, ad similem nobis modum variantur. *De Deo Socratis.*

ⁿ Ep. 95.

was

was a mistaken Notion concerning *the Nature of God*, so this was concerning *the Nature of the Soul*.

There are but two possible Ways of conceiving of the *Soul*; either as of a *Quality*, or a *Substance*.

1. Those Ancients who held it to be only a *Quality*, as *Epicurus*, *Dicæarchus*, *Aristoxenus*, *Asclepiades*, and *Galen*, come not into the Account; it being impossible that these should not believe its total Annihilation upon Death.

2. But the generality of the Philosophers held it to be a *Substance*; and all who so held, were unanimous that it was a *discerped Part* of a *Whole*: and that this *Whole* was *God*; into whom it was again to be *resolved*.

But concerning this *Whole* they differed.

Some held there was only *one* Substance in Nature; some held *two*.

They who maintained the one universal Substance, or TO 'EN in the strictest Sense, were Atheists; and altogether in the Sentiments of the modern *Spinozists*; whose Master, apparently, caught this Contagion of human Reason from Antiquity.

The Others, who believed there were two general *Substances* in Nature, *God* and *Matter*, were taught to conclude, by their Way of Interpreting the famous Maxim of *ex nihilo nihil fit*, that they were both eternal. These were their Theists; though approaching more or less according to their several Subdivisions, to what we now call *Spinozism*.

These latter, who held two Substances, were again subdivided.

Some of them, as the *Cyrenaics*, the *Cynics*, and the *Stoics*, held *both* these Substances to be material. Others, as the *Pythagoreans*, the *Platonists*, and *Peripatetics*, only *one*: The former approaching to
the

the gross Opinions of the atheistical Philosophers, who held but one universal Substance.

Again, the Maintainers of the *Immateriality* of the Divine Substance, were likewise divided into two Parties; the first of which held but *one* Person in the Godhead; the other, *two* or *three*. So that as the *former* believed the Soul to be part of the Supreme God; the *latter* believed it to be part only of the second or third Hypostasis.

As they multiplied the Persons of the Godhead, so they did the Subsistence of the Soul. Some giving *two*, and some more liberally, *three* to every Man. But it is to be observed, that they esteemed only one of them to be part of God; the other were only elementary Matter, or mere Qualities.

These things are but just hinted at, which is sufficient to our Purpose: A full Explanation of them would take up too much Room, and lead us too far from our Subject.

Now, however they who held the Soul a real Substance, differed thus in Circumstantials, yet in this Consequence of its Substantiality; *that it was part of God, discerned from him, and would be resolved again into him*, they all agreed. For those who held but one Substance, must needs esteem the Soul a part of it. And those who held *two*, considered them as conjoined and composing an *Universe*; just as the Soul and Body composed a *Man*. Of which Universe God was the Soul, and Matter the Body. Hence they concluded, that as the human Body was resolved into its Parent Matter, so the Soul was resolved into its Parent Spirit.

Agreeably to what we have said, *Cicero* delivers the common Sentiments of his *Greek* Masters on this Head. “*A natura Deorum, ut doctissimis sapientissimisque placuit, haustos animos & libatos habemus*”.

And again: "Humanus autem animus *decerptus* " *ex mente divina*, cum alio nullo nisi cum ipso Deo " comparari potest^p.

And that the Reader may not suspect these kind of Phrases, as, that the *Soul is part of God*; *discerped from him*; *of his Nature*; which perpetually occur in the Writings of the Ancients, to be only *highly figurate Expressions*, and not to be measured by the severe Standard of metaphysical Propriety; he is desired to take Notice of one Consequence drawn from this Principle, and universally held by Antiquity, which was this, *that the Soul was eternal à parte ante, as well as à parte post*; which the *Latins* well expressed by the Word SEMPI-TERNUS^q.

For

^p *Tusc. disp. 1. 5. c. 13.*

^q It properly signifies, *what hath neither Beginning nor End*; though frequently used in the improper Sense of *having no End*. And indeed, we may observe in most of the *Latin* Writers, an unphilosophic Licence in the Use of one *mixed Mode* for another: which are the only kind of Words that can well be liable to this Abuse. The providing against the ill Effects of this Licence, gave the ancient *Roman* Lawyers great Pains; as appears from this Testimony of one of them: *Juris consultorum summus circa verborum proprietatem labor est*. And modern Lawyers and Grammarians have laboured much on this Subject, but with no great Success: The first being only capable of doing it partially; the other, not at all. The Philosopher only is equal to it. This Abuse proceeded, in a good Measure, from the *Romans* not being broken and inured to Speculation and abstract Reasoning. For it is certain that the *Greeks*, who were eminently practised in this Way, are infinitely more exact in their Use of such Words. Not but something must be allowed for the superior Copiousness of that Language. For I can never be brought to think, even on the Authority of *Tully*, that the *Latin* is the more Copious of the two. But his Inconstancy in this Opinion, shews that too much of Self-love mingled with his Judgment. He was the great Improver of the *Latin* Tongue: and it is pleasant to observe the Progress of his Thoughts in this particular. In the Beginning of his Project to enlarge his own Language, he owned the *Greek* to be more Copious: As he advanced in his Labour, he changed his Note, and would then

For this we shall produce an Authority above Exception: "It is a thing very well known (says the great *Cudworth*) that, according to the Sense of Philosophers, these two things were always included together, in that one Opinion of the Soul's Immortality, namely, its *Pre-existence*, as well as its *Post-existence*. Neither was there ever any of the Ancients, before Christianity, that held the Soul's future Permanency after Death, who did not likewise assert its *Pre-existence*; they *clearly perceiving* that if it was once granted, that the Soul was generated, it could never be proved but that it might be also corrupted. And therefore the Assertors of the Soul's Immortality commonly began here; first to prove its *Pre-existence*, &c.^r" What this learned Man is quoted for, is the *Fact*: And for that we may safely take his Word: As to the *Reason* he gives, that we see, is visionary; invented perhaps, to hide the Enormity of the Principle it came from. The true *Reason* was its being a natural Consequence of the Opinion, that *the Soul was Part of God*.

Here then, is a Consequence universally acknowledged, that will not allow the Principle, from whence it proceeded, to be understood in any other than a strict metaphysical Sense. Let us consider it a little: We are told they held the Soul, *eternal*: If eternal, it must be either independent on God, or part of his Substance. Independent it could not be, for there can be but one Independent of the same kind of Substance: the Ancients, indeed, thought it no Absurdity to say, that God and Matter were both Self-existent, but they al-

then put them both upon a Level: But in his latter Works, when he had now finished his Improvements, he maintains without any Hesitation, that the *Latin* Tongue was even more Copious than the *Greek*. ^r *Intel. System*, p. 38.

lowed

lowed no third ; therefore they must needs conclude that *it was Part of God.*

But when the Ancients are said to hold the *Pre- and Post-existence* of the Soul, and therefore to attribute a proper Eternity to it, we must not suppose, that they understood it to be eternal in its *distinct and peculiar Existence* ; but that it was discerped from the Substance of God, *in time* ; and would, *in time*, be rejoined, and resolved into it again. Which they explained by a Bottle's being filled with Sea Water, that swimming there a while, on the Bottle's breaking, flowed in again, and mingled with the common Mass. They only differed about the Time of this *Reunion and Resolution* : The greater Part holding it to be at Death, but the *Pythagoreans* not till after many Transmigrations. The *Platonists* went between these two Opinions : and rejoined pure and unpolluted Souls, immediately on Death, to the universal Spirit. But those which had contracted much Defilement, were sent into a Succession of other Bodies, to purge and purify them, before they returned to their Parent Substance. And these were the two sorts of the *natural Metempsychosis*, which we have observed above, to have been really held by those two Schools of Philosophy.

That we have given a fair Representation of the ancient Belief in this Matter, we appeal to the learned *Gassendi* : “ Interim tamen vix ulli fuere
 “ (quæ humanæ mentis caligo, atque imbecillitas
 “ est) qui non inciderint in errorem illum de RE-
 “ FUSIONE IN ANIMAM MUNDI. Nimirum, sicut
 “ existimârunt singulorum animas particulas esse
 “ Animæ Mundanæ, quarum quælibet suo corpore,
 “ ut aqua vase, includeretur ; ita et reputârunt u-
 “ namquamque animam, corpore dissoluto, quasi dif-
 “ fracto vase, effluere, ac animæ Mundi, è qua de-
 “ ducta

“ ducta fuerit, iterum uniri ; nisi quòd plerumque
 “ ob contractas in impuro corpore sordeis, vitio-
 “ rumque maculas, non prius uniantur, quàm sen-
 “ sim omneis sordeis exuerint, et aliæ seriùs, aliæ
 “ ocyùs repurgatæ, atque immunes ab omni labe
 “ evaserint.” A great Authority ; and a greater,
 for that it proceeded from the plain View of the
 Fact only, he appearing not to have been sensi-
 ble of the Consequence we would deduce from
 thence ; namely, that none of the ancient Philoso-
 phers could believe a future State of Rewards and
 Punishments. Otherwise we may be sure, he had
 not failed to urge that Consequence, in *Apology*
 for *Epicurus* ; whose monstrous Errors he has la-
 boured, through three large Volumes, to keep in
 Countenance, by confronting them with as great
 amongst the other Sects of Philosophy.

Thus we see, that this very Opinion of the
Soul's Eternity, which hath made modern Writers
 conclude, the Philosophers believed a future State
 of Reward and Punishment, was in truth the very
 Reason why they believed it not.

The primitive *Christian* Writers were more
 quick sighted : they plainly saw this Principle was
 destructive of such future State, and therefore,
 opposed it with all their Power. Thus *Arnobius*
 (not indeed attending to the double Doctrine of the
 ancient Philosophy) accuses *Plato* of Contradiction,
 for holding this Principle, and yet, at the same
 Time, preaching up a future State of Reward
 and Punishment. “ Quid ? *Plato* idem vester in
 “ eo volumine, quod de animæ immortalitate com-
 “ posuit, non Acherontem, non Stygem, non Co-
 “ cytum fluvios, & *Pyrìphlegetontem* nominat, in
 “ quibus animas asseverat volvi, mergi, exuri ? Et

§ *Animadv. in decimum librum Diogenis Laertii, p. 550.*

“ homo prudentiæ non parvæ, & examinis judi-
 “ cique perpenſi, rem inenodabilem ſuſcipit, ut
 “ cum animas dicat immortales, perpetuas, & cor-
 “ porali ſoliditate privatas; puniri eas dicat tamen,
 “ & doloris afficiat ſenſu. Quis autem hominum
 “ non videt, quod ſit immortale, quod ſimplex,
 “ nullum poſſe dolorem admittere? quod autem ſen-
 “ tiat dolorem, immortalitatem habere non poſſe.
 “ Et qui poterit territari formidinis alicujus hor-
 “ rore, cui fuerit perſuaſum, tam ſe eſſe immorta-
 “ lem quam ipſum Deum primum? Nec ab eo
 “ judicari quidquam de ſe poſſe: cum ſit una im-
 “ mortalitas in utroque, nec in alterius altera con-
 “ ditionis poſſit æqualitate vexari.”

But it muſt be confeſſed, ſome of the *Fathers*,
 as was their Cuſtom, ran into the oppoſite ex-
 treme; and held the Soul to be naturally mortal;
 and to ſupport this, maintained its *Materiality*.
 Juſt as in the Caſe before, to ſupport *human Paſ-
 ſions* in the Godhead, they taught he had a *human
 Form*. Into this Extravagance fell *Tatian*, *Ter-
 tullian*, and *Arnobius*. Others indeed, as *Juſtin
 Martyr*, and *Irenæus*, went more ſoberly to work;
 affirming only, againſt the Notion of its *Eternity*,
 that it was created by God, and depended conti-
 nually upon him for its Duration. In the Heat of
 Diſpute, indeed, ſome unwary Words now and
 then drop from the ſobereſt of them, that ſeem
 to favour the Doctrine of the Soul's Mortality:
 But it is but reaſonable to correct them, by the
general Tenor of their Sentiments.

This was the true Original of every thing that
 looks that Way, in the Diſputations of the *Fathers*,
 and will lead us to their right Meaning. Had
 Mr. *Dodwell* but conſidered this, he had ſcarce

‘ *Adver. Gentes*, l. 2. p. 52—64. *Ed. Lug. Bat. 1651.*
 Quarto

wrote so weak a Book as his *Epistolary Discourse* against the Soul's Immortality, from the *Judgment of the Fathers* : Which for want, as we say, of due Reflection, he has egregiously mistaken.

Having now shewn that the Philosophers, in general, held *the Soul's being part of God, and resolvable into him* ; that no kind of Doubt may remain, we shall prove in the next place, that it was believed particularly by the famous *philosophic Quaternion*.

Thales, the first of the *Italic School*, which received a new Birth, as well as Lustre, from *Pythagoras*, always maintained, as *Cicero* tells us in his *Book of Consolation*, that *the Soul was Part or Parcel of the Divine Substance* ; and that it returns to it, as soon as it is disengaged from the Body. He bears the same Testimony against *PYTHAGORAS* himself, under the Person of *Velleius*, the *Epicurean*. “ *Nam Pythagoras, qui censuit Animum esse per*
“ *naturam rerum omnem intentum & commean-*
“ *tem, ex quo nostri animi carperentur, non vidit*
“ *distractione humanorum animorum discerpi & la-*
“ *cerari Deum*.” To the same Purpose, *Sextus Empiricus* : — *Pythagoras* and *Empedocles*, and the whole Company of the *Italic School*, hold that our Souls are not only of the same Nature with one another, and with the Gods, but likewise with the irrational Souls of Brutes. For that there is one Spirit that pervades the Universe, and serves it for a Soul, which unites us altogether into one^u. Lastly, *Laertius* tells us, *Pythagoras* held that the Soul was different from

^u *Nat. Deor.* l. i. c. 11.

^w Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐν τῇ Πυθαγόρῃ καὶ τῇ Εμπεδοκλείᾳ, καὶ τῇ Ἰταλῷ, πολλοὶ φασι μὴ μόνον ἡμῖν πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ πρὸς τὰς θεάς εἶναι τινα κοινωνίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἄλλα τῷ ζῶντι ἐν ᾧ ὑπάρχειν πνέοντα, τὸ ἀπὸ παντός τῷ κόσμῳ διήκον ψυχῆς τέλει, τὸ καὶ εἶναι ἡμᾶς πρὸς ἐκείνα. *Lib. 9. Adv. Physic. § 127.*

the Life ; and was immortal ; for that the Substance, from which it was taken, was immortal*.

PLATO, without any detour, frequently calls the Soul God, and Part of God, ΝΟΥΝ ΑΕΙ ΘΕΟΝ. Plutarch says, Pythagoras and Plato held the Soul to be immortal : for that launching out into the Soul of the Universe, it returns to its Parent and Original^y. Arnobius charges the same Opinion on the Platonists, where he Apostrophises them, in this Manner : “ Ipse denique animus, qui immortalis
“ à vobis, & deus esse narratur, cur in ægris æger
“ sit, in infantibus stolidus, in senectute defessus ?
“ Delira, et fatua, & insana^z.”

There is indeed a Passage in Stobæus, that has been understood by some, to contradict what we have here delivered for the Sentiments of Plato. It is where Speusippus, the Nephew and Follower of Plato, says that the MIND was neither the same with THE ONE, nor THE GOOD ; but had a peculiar Nature of its own^a. Our Stanley supposes^b him to speak here of the human Mind : And then indeed, nothing can more directly contradict what we have affirmed of Plato above. But that learned Man

* Διαφέρειν τε ψυχὴν, ζωῆς ἀθάνατόν τε ἢ αὐτὴν, ἐπειδήπερ ἡ τὸ εἶναι ἢ ἀπέσπασται, ἀθάνατον ἐστίν. Vit. Phil. 1. 8. § 28.

^y Πιθανότατα, Πλάτων, ἄσθαλει ἢ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξῆσσαν γὰρ εἰς τὸ πάντος ψυχὴν, ἀναχωρεῖν πρὸς τὸ ὁμοῦλον. De Plac. Phil. 1. 4. c. 7.

^z Adv. Gentes, 1. 2. p. 47. The latter Part of the Sentence is commonly read thus : — Cur in ægris æger sit, in infantibus stolidus, in senectute defessus, delira, et fatua, et insana ? The Critics think something is here wanting before the three last Words. But it appears to me only to have been wrong pointed ; there should be a Note of Interrogation instead of a Comma, at defessus. — Delira, et fatua, et insana, making a Sentence of itself, by Means of narratis understood.

^a Σπεύσιππος τὸ ἰὸν ἔτε τῷ ἐν, ὅτε τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ αὐτὸν, ἰδιόφῃ δέ. Ecl. Phys. 1. 1. c. 1.

^b Hist. of Phil. pt. 5. Ari. (Speusippus) c. 2.

seems

seems to have been mistaken, and misled by his Author *Stobæus*; who has put this *Placit* in a Chapter with several others, that relate to the human Mind: Whereas I conceive it evident, that *Speusippus* was here speaking of a very different thing, from what that Collector imagined, namely, of the Nature of the third Hypostasis in the *Platonic* Trinity, the ΝΟΥΣ, or λόγος, so intituled by his Uncle. Which he would, by the Words in Question, personally distinguish from the ΕΙΣ the ONE, the first Person, and from the ΑΓΑΘΟΣ, the good, the second in that Trinity. This Interpretation, which seems to clear up a very unintelligible Passage, is submitted to the Judgment of the Learned.

ARISTOTLE thought of the Soul like the rest, as we learn from a Passage quoted by *Cudworth*^c, out of his *Nichomachean Ethics*; where having spoke of the sensitive Souls, and declared them mortal; he goes on in this Manner: — *It remains that the Mind or Intellect, and that alone (pre-existing) enter from without, and be only DIVINE*^d.

But then he distinguishes again concerning this *Mind or Intellect*, and makes it two-fold; *Agent* and *Patient*: The former of which, he concludes to be *immortal*, and the latter *corruptible*. *The agent Intellect is only immortal and eternal, but the passive is corruptible*^e. *Cudworth* thinks this a very doubtful and obscure Passage; and imagines *Aristotle* was led to write thus unintelligibly, by his Doctrine of *Forms* and *Qualities*, whereby corporeal, and incorporeal Substances are confounded together. But had that great Man reflected on the general Doctrine of the ΤΟ ἘΝ, he would have

^c *Intel. System*, p. 55.

^d Λείπεται ὃ τὸ νῦν μόνον θύραθεν ἐπισυνέει, καὶ θεῖον ἐστὶ μόνον.

^e Τὸ το μόνον αἰθέριον καὶ αἰδίων, ὃ δὲ παθητικὸν νῦν φθαρτὸν.

seen the Passage was plain and easy; and that *Aristotle*, from the common Principle of the human Soul's being Part of the divine Substance, here draws a Conclusion against a future State of separate Existence; which, though it now appears all the Philosophers embraced, yet all were not (as we said) so forward to avow. The obvious meaning of the Words then is this: — *The agent Intelligent* (says he) *is only immortal and eternal, but the passive corruptible, i. e.* The particular Sensations of the Soul (*the passive Intelligent*) will cease after Death; and the Substance of it (*the agent Intelligent*) will be resolved into the Soul of the Universe. For it was *Aristotle's* Opinion, who compared the Soul to a *rasa tabula*, that human Sensations and Reflections were Passions: These therefore are what he finely calls the *passive Intelligent*; which, he says, shall cease; or is corruptible. What he meant by the *agent Intelligent*, we learn from his Commentators; who interpret it to signify, as *Cudworth* here acknowledges, the DIVINE INTELLECT; which *Gloss Aristotle* himself fully justifies, in calling it ΘΕΙΟΝ, *Divine*.

Thus this seeming extravagant Division of the human Mind into *Agent* and *Patient*, appears very plain and accurate: But the not having this common Key to the ancient Metaphysics, hath kept the Followers of *Aristotle* long at Variance amongst themselves, whether their Master did believe the Soul mortal or immortal. The anonymous Writer of the Life of *Pythagoras*, extracted by *Photius*, says, that *Plato* and *Aristotle*, with one Consent, agree that the Soul is immortal. Though some, not fathoming the profound Mind of *Aristotle*, suppose that he held the Soul to be mortal; that is, mistaking the

[†] Ὅτι Πλάτων, Φασί, καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης, ἀθάνατον ὁμοίως λέγουσι τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸ Ἀριστοτέλης μὲν εἶναι ἐμψυχθῆναι, θνήσκουσαν αὐτὴν λέγειν. Phot. Bibli. Cod. 259.

passive Intelligent (by which *Aristotle* meant the present partial Sensations) for the Soul itself, or the *agent Intelligent*. Nay, this Way of talking of the *passive Intelligent*, made some, as *Nemesius*, even imagine that he held the Soul to be only a *Quality*^g.

As to the *Stoics*, let *Seneca* speak first for them. *And why should you not believe something divine to be in him, who is indeed PART OF THE GOD-HEAD? That WHOLE, in which we are contained, is ONE, and that one is GOD; we being his Companions and Members*^h.

Epietetus says, the Souls of Men have the nearest Relation to God, as being Parts, or Fragments of him, dispersed and torn from his Substanceⁱ.

Lastly, *Marcus Antoninus*, as a Consolation against the Fear of Death, says — (To die) is not only according to the Course of Nature, but of great Use to it. [We should consider] how closely Man is united to the Godhead, and in what Part of him that Union resides; and what will be the Condition of that Part or Portion when it is resolved [into the anima mundi^k.]

C c 4

After

ε 'Οι μὲν ἄλλοι τὴν ψυχὴν εἶναι λέγουσι εἶναι, Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ καὶ Δεῖναρχος ἀνέστησαν. *De Nat. Hom.*

^h Quid est autem, cur non existimes in eo divini aliquid existere qui Dei pars est? totum hoc, quo continemur, et unum est, et Deus: et focii ejus fumus, et membra. *Ep.* 92.

ⁱ Συναφείς τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτε αὐτῇ μέρος ἔσται καὶ διασπασμένα. This Passage amongst others, equally strong, is quoted by the Learned *Moore*, in his *Immortality of the Soul*, Book 3d. Chap. 16. And I could not but smile at the good Doctor's Reflection on a general Principle, that he did not like. *These Expressions*, says he, *make the Soul of Man a Ray or Beam of the Soul of the World, or of God. But we are to take Notice, THEY ARE BUT METAPHORICAL PHRASES.* And so the *Socinian*, to Texts of Scripture equally strong for the *Doctrine of the Redemption*, replies, *You are to take Notice they are but metaphorical Phrases.*

^k Τὴτο μὲν τοι εἰ μόνον φύσει, ἔργον ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ συμφέρον αὐτῇ πῶς ἀπλεται θεῷ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ καὶ τί αὐτῇ μέρος, καὶ πῶς ἔχει ὅταν ἀλκήνῃαι τὸ εἰς ἀθρώπου τὴτο μέρος. *Εἰς ἑαυτὸν.* L. 2.

After all this, one cannot sufficiently admire how the great *Cudworth* came to say, “ All those
 “ *Pagan* Philosophers who asserted the Incorporeity
 “ of Souls, must of *Necessity*, in like Manner, sup-
 “ pose them not to have been made out of pre-
 “ existing Matter, but by God, *out of nothing*.
 “ *Plutarch* being *only here to be excepted*, by Rea-
 “ son of a certain odd Hypothesis which he had,
 “ that was peculiarly his own, of a third Principle
 “ besides God and Matter, an evil Demon, self-
 “ existent; who therefore seems to have supposed
 “ all particular human Souls to have been made
 “ neither out of nothing, nor yet out of Matter or
 “ Body, pre-existing, but out of a certain strange
 “ Commixture of the Substance of the evil Soul,
 “ and God blended together; upon which Account,
 “ does he affirm Souls to be not so much *ἔξου*, as
 “ *μέρος θεῶ*, not so much *the Work of God*, as *Part*
 “ *of him*¹.

i. He thinks those Philosophers who held the Incorporeity of the Soul, must of *Necessity* believe it to be made by God out of nothing. Why? Because they could not suppose it to be made out of pre-existing Matter. But is there no other pre-

c. 12. Here the Doctrine of the *πὲν* is hinted at, but Writing to Adepts, he is a little Obscure. The Editors have made a very confused Comment and Translation: The common Reading of the latter Part of the Passage is, *καὶ ὅταν πῶς ἔχη ἀφ-
 πείσαι τὸ ὁ ἀνθρώπου τὸ το μόνον*. Which is certainly corrupt. *Gataker* very accurately transposed the Words thus: *καὶ πῶς
 ἔχη ὅταν*, and for *ἀφ-πείσαι*, read *διήκῃσαι*. *Mer. Casaubon*, more happily, *ἀφ-κίῃσαι*. They have the true Reading between them: But not being aware that the Doctrine of the *Refusion* was here alluded to, they could not settle the Text with any Certainty. The last Word *ΜΟΡΙΟΝ* can signify nothing else but a discerped Particle from *the Soul of the World*. *Epicletus* uses it in that Sense above, and it seems to be the technical Term for it.

¹ *Insel. System*, p. 741.

existing Substance, out of which it might have been made? Yes, the *Divine*. And from thence, we see in Fact, the Philosophers supposed it to be taken. The great Author has therefore concluded too hastily.

2. He thinks *Plutarch* was *single*, in conceiving the Soul to be a *Part*, rather than a *Work* of God; and that he was led into this Error by the *Manichean* Principle: But how *that* should lead any one into it, is utterly inconceivable. It is true indeed, that he who already believes the Soul to be μέγος, or μόγιον θεῶν, a Part or Particle of the Divinity, if he holds *two Principles*, will naturally hold the Soul to have a Part from each. And so indeed did *Plutarch*; and in *this only*, differed from the rest of the Philosophers; who, as to the general Tenet of μέγος, and not ἐξου θεῶν, that the Soul was *rather a Part, than a Work of God*, went all of them along with him.

Such was the general Doctrine on this Point, before the coming of Christianity; but then those Philosophers, who held out against its Truth, new modelled both their Philosophy and Religion, making their Philosophy more religious, and their Religion more philosophical: of which we have given several occasional Instances in the Course of this Work. So amongst the many Improvements of Paganism, the softening this Doctrine was one. The modern *Platonists* confining the Notion, of the Soul's being Part of the divine Substance, to those of Brutes. Every irrational Power (says *Porphyry*) is resolved into the Life of the whole^m.

This then being the general Notion of the Philosophers concerning the Nature of the Soul, there could not possibly be any room for their believing a future State of Rewards and Punishments: And how much the Ancients understood the Disbelief of

^m Λύεται ἐκάστη δύναμις ἈΛΟΓΟΣ εἰς τὴν ὅλην ζωὴν Ἐπανόως.
this,

this, to be the Consequence of holding the other, we have a very remarkable Instance in *Strabo*. That excellent Writer speaking of the Religion of *Moses*, thus expresses himself: *For he [Moses] affirmed and taught that the Egyptians and Libyans conceived amiss, in representing the Divinity under the Form of Beasts and Cattle; nor were the Greeks less mistaken to picture him in a human Shape. For God was only ONE, which contains all Mankind, the Earth, and Sea, and WHICH we call HEAVEN, THE WORLD AND THE NATURE OF ALL THINGS*". This, as may be better seen by the Original below, is the rankest *Spinozism*. But how unjustly charged on the *Jewish* Legislator, we have his divine Writings to evidence; which they do so effectually, that was any one, on set Purpose, to draw up an Idea of the Deity, in order to oppose it to that monstrous Notion, he could not do it in stronger, or less ambiguous Terms. What then, you will say, could be the Reason of so ingenious, so candid, so learned a Writer's giving this false Representation of an Author, whose Laws he had certainly read? I take the true Solution of the Difficulty (which *Toland* has wrote a senseless Dissertation^o to aggravate and invenom) to be this: *Strabo* well knew, that all who held the TO' ^oEN, denied, and necessarily, a future State of Reward and Punishment. And finding in the Laws of *Moses* so extraordinary a Circumstance, as the Omission of such future State in the national Religion, he concluded backwards, that the Reason could be nothing less than the Author's believing

"Ἐρῆ γὰρ ἑαῖνος καὶ ἐδίδασκεν, ὡς οὐκ ἐβλῶς φρονέουσιν οἱ Ἀσι-
γῆπτοι θεοῖς εἰκαζόντες, καὶ βοσκήμασι τὸ θεῖον εἶδ' οἱ Λίβυες·
οὕτω δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἕλληνες, ἀνθρωπομόρφους τυπῶντες· εἴη γὰρ ἐν τῷτο
μόνῳ θεῷ τὸ πᾶν ἔχον, ἡμᾶς ἀπαντὰς, καὶ γῆν καὶ θάλατταν, ὃ καλεῖ-
ται οὐρανὸν καὶ κόσμον, καὶ τὰ ὅλην φύσιν. *Geog.* l. 16.

^o See his *Origines Judaicae*.

the TO' EN. For these two Ideas were inseparably connected in the Imagination of the *Greeks*.

But now though we have shewn the Notion to be so malignant, as more or less, to have infected all the ancient *Greek* Philosophy; yet no one, I hope, will think there needs any thing to be said in Confutation of so absurd and unphilosophic a Tenet. Mr. *Bayle* thinks it even more irrational than the plastic Atoms of *Epicurus*: *Le Systeme des Atomes n'est pas à beaucoup près aussi absurde que le Spinozisme^p*: And judges it cannot stand against the Demonstrations of *Newton*: *Je croi que les Spinozistes se trouveroient bien embarrassés, si on les forçoit d'admettre les Demonstrations de Mr. Newton^q*. In this he judged right, and we have lately seen a Book, intituled, *An Enquiry into the Nature of the human Soul*, &c. so well reasoned on the Principles of that Philosophy, as everlastingly to dispel the impious Phantasm of Spinozism. He who would see the justest and precisest Notions of *God* and the *Soul*, may read that Book; one of the most finished of the kind, in my humble Opinion, that the present Times, greatly advanced in true Philosophy, have produced.

But it will be asked from whence the *Greeks* had this strange Opinion: for we know they were not ΑΥΤΟΔΙΔΑΚΤΟΙ. It will be said, perhaps, from *Egypt*; from whence they had their Learning. And the Books which go under the Name of TRISMEGISTUS, and pretend to contain a Body of the ancient *Egyptian* Wisdom, being very full and explicit in Favour of the TO' EN, have very much confirmed this Opinion. And though the Imposture of those Works has been thoroughly

^p *Crit. Dict. Article (Democrite.)*

^q *Ib. Ar. (Leucippe) Rem. (G) à la fin.*

exposed^r; yet on Pretence that the Composers took the Substance of them from the ancient *Egyptian* Physiology, they preserve, I don't know how, a certain Authority amongst the Learned, by no means due to them.

However, I shall venture to maintain, the *Notion* was purely *Grecian*.

1. For first, it is a refined, remote, imaginary Conclusion from true and simple Principles; which Character it so much manifests, both in its Subtilty and Absurdity, that many have fallen into it unawares, and no sooner seen it, than they have detested and abhorred it^t. But the ancient *Barbaric* Philosophy, as we are informed by the *Greeks*, consisted only of detached Placits or Tenets, delivered down from Tradition; without any thing like Speculation, in a System, or by *Hypothesis*. Now Refinement and Subtilty are the Consequence only of these Inventions.

But of all the *Barbarians*, this Humour would of Course be least seen in the *Egyptians*; whose Sages were not sedentary scholastic *Sophists*, like the *Grecian*, but employed and busied in the public Affairs of Religion and Government. By such Characters, we may be assured, even the most solid Sciences would be pushed no farther than the Use of Life. And that in fact they were not, we have a singular Instance in the Case of *Pythagoras*. *Jamblicus* tells us that, *he spent two and twenty Years in Egypt, studying Astronomy and Geometry*^t. And yet, after his return to *Samos*, he himself discovered the famous 47th Prop. of the 1ⁿ

^r *Is. Casaubon, cont. Bar. Exerc. 1. N° 18.*

^t *See Limborg's Theol. Christ. 1. 2. c. 15. & Pietas Burmannorum.*

^t Δύο δὲ καὶ ἑκοσιν ἔτη καὶ ᾧ Ἀλεξανδρῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀδύτοις διετέλεσεν ἀστρονομῶν, καὶ γεωμετρῶν. — *Vit Pyth. c. 4.*

Book of Euclid; which so transported him, that we are told, he sacrificed a Hecatomb to the *Muses*. This, though a very *useful*, is yet a very *simple* Theorem: and not being reached by the *Egyptian* Geometry, shews they had not advanced far in such Speculations. So again, in Astronomy; *Thales* is said to be the first who predicted an Eclipse of the Sun; nor did the *Egyptians*, or any other *Barbarians*, pretend to dispute that Honour with him. To this it will be said, that the *Egyptians* certainly taught *Pythagoras* the true Constitution of what we call the Solar System. We grant they did; but it is as certain, that they taught it not scientifically, but dogmatically, as they received it from Tradition; of which one Proof is, its being so soon lost after the *Greeks* began to Hypothesise.

It will be asked then, in what consisted this boasted Wisdom of *Egypt*; which we have so much extolled throughout this Work; and for which we have so large warrant from *Holy Scripture*. I reply in the Science of LEGISLATION and CIVIL POLICY: but this by the Bye.

That the *Egyptians* did not philosophise by Hypothesis and System, appears farther from the Character of their first *Greek* Disciples. For those early *Wise Men*, who fetched their Philosophy from *Egypt*, brought it home in detached, and independent *Placits*; which was certainly as they found it. And, as the fine Writer of *The Enquiry into the Life of Homer*, who has at length revealed to us the whole Mystery of his divine Poems, says, *there was yet no SEPARATION of WISDOM; the Philosopher and the Divine, the Legislator and the Poet, were all united in the same Person*. Nor had they yet any Sects or Succession of Schools; these were late, and therefore the *Greeks* could not be mistaken in their Accounts of this Matter.

One of the first, as well as noblest Systems of Physics, is the Atomic Hypothesis, as it was revived by *Des Cartes*. This, without all Doubt, was a *Greek* Invention; nothing being better settled, than that *Democritus* and *Leucippus* were the Authors. But *Possidonius*, either out of Envy or Whim, would rob them of this Honour, and give it to one *Moschus* a *Phenician*. Our great *Cudworth* has gone into this fancy, and made of that unknown *Moschus*, the most celebrated Lawgiver of the *Jews*. The Learned Dr. *Burnet* having clearly overthrown this Notion, and vindicated to the two *Greeks* the Right of their Discovery, concludes in these Words: “Præterea non videtur mihi fa-
“pere indolem antiquissimorum temporum iste
“modus philosophandi per hypothèses & princi-
“piorum systemata; quem modum, ab intro-
“ductis Atomis, statim sequebantur Philosophi.
“Hæc *Græcæ* sunt, ut par est credere, & se-
“quioris ævi. Durasse mihi videtur ultra Tro-
“jana tempora philosophia traditiva, quæ ratioci-
“niis & causarum explicatione non nitebatur, sed
“alterius generis & originis doctrinâ, primigeniâ
“et *παλαιογενή*.”

This being the Case, we may easily know what *Plato* meant in saying, *that the Greeks improved whatever Science they received from the Barbarians*”. Which Words *Celsus* seems to Paraphrase, where he says, *the Barbarians were good at INVENTING OPINIONS, but the Greeks only were able to PERFECT and SUPPORT them* *.

So

* *Archæol. Phil.* l. i. c. 6.

¶ Διὸ καὶ, ὡς ὁ Πλάτων φησὶν, ὁ, τε ἂν καὶ ἀπὸ βαρβάρων μαθήματα λάβωσιν οἱ Ἕλληνες, τὸτο ἄμεινον ἐμφέρεται. *Anon. de Vit. Pyth. ap. Photium, Cod.* 259.

* Καὶ σύγγραμμα γὰρ οὐκ οἰοῖται ἐπὶ τῇ ἀπὸ βαρβάρων ἀρχῇ τοῦ λόγου, ἱππικῶν ὡς ἱππικὸς οὖρεν δόγματα τοῖς βαρβάρους πεποιηθεῖν.

So much was the Author of *The Voyages of Cyrus* mistaken, in thinking that *the Orientalists had a Genius more subtle and metaphysical than the Greeks*^y. But he apparently formed his Judgment on this Matter, from what is seen of the modern Genius of that People; which learnt to speculate of the *Greek Philosophers*; whose Writings, since the *Arabian Conquests*, have been translated into the Languages of the *East*.

It appears therefore, from the Nature of the *Barbaric Philosophy*, that such a Notion as that of the TO' 'EN could not be *Egyptian*.

2. But we shall shew next, that it was in Fact, a *Greek Invention*; by the best Argument, the Discovery of the Inventers.

TULLY speaking of PHERECYDES SYRUS, the Master of *Pythagoras*, says that he was the first amongst the *Greeks* who affirmed the Souls of Men to be ETERNAL. *Phercydes Syrius primum dixit animos hominum esse SEMPITERNOS; antiquus sane; fuit enim meo regnante gentili. Hanc opinionem discipulus ejus Pythagoras maximè confirmavit*^z. This is a very extraordinary Passage. If it be taken in the common Sense of the Interpreters, that *Phercydes was the first, or the first of the Greeks, that taught the Immortality of the Soul*, nothing can be more false or extravagant. Tully himself well knew the Contrary, as appears from several Places of his Works, where he represents the *Immortality of the Soul*, as a Thing taught from the most early Times of Memory, and by all Mankind: The Author and Original of it, as *Plutarch* assures us, being entirely unknown; which indeed might be

ὅτι τῶν τοιούτων, ὅτι κελίαι καὶ βιβλίσκοι τὰ πρὸς τὰς ἐκδόσεις ἐξέδονται, ἀμείνων ἐστὶν ἔργα. Orig. cont. Celsus, p. 5.

^y Voir Disc. sur la Mythologie.

^z Tusc. Disp. l. 1. c. 16.

easily gathered, by any attentive Considerer, from the very early Practice of deifying the Dead. *Tully* therefore must needs mean quite another thing; which the exact Propriety of the Word *Sempiternus* will lead us to. *Donatus* the Grammarian, tells us, *that* *SEMPITERNUS* properly relates to the Gods, and *PERPETUUS* to Men. *Sempiternum ad deos, perpetuum proprie ad homines pertinet*^a. Here then, a proper Eternity is attributed to the Soul; a Consequence that could only spring, and does spring necessarily from the Principle of the Soul's being *Part of God*. Thus has *Tully* given us a very illustrious Piece of History; that not only fixes the Doctrine of the *TOTEN* to Greece, but Records the Inventer of it; which is farther confirmed by what he adds, that *Pherecydes's* Scholar, *Pythagoras*, took it from him, and by the Authority of his own Name added great Credit to it; so great indeed, that, as we have seen, it soon over-spread all the *Greek* Philosophy. And I make no Question but it was *Pherecydes's* broaching this Impiety, and not hiding it by the Use of the double Doctrine, so carefully as did his great Disciple, that made him pass amongst the People, as with great Reason it might, for an Atheist. And if the Story of his mocking at all religious Worship, which *Ælian*^b tells us of him, be true, and considering this Principle of Spinozism, it is not unlikely, it would much confirm the popular Opinion.

That *Pherecydes* was the Inventer of this Notion, and not barely the Original of it to the *Greeks*, may not only be collected from what hath been said above of the different Genius of the *Greek* and *Barbaric* Philosophy, but from what *Suidas*

^a In *And. Ter.* Act. 5. Sc. 5.

^b *Var. Hist.* l. 4. c. 29.

tells us of his being self-taught, and having no Master or Director of his Studies^c.

But as the *Greeks* had two Inventors of their best physical Principle, *Democritus* and *Leucippus*; so had they two likewise of this their worst metaphysical. For we have as positive Attestation for *THALES*, as we have seen before for *Phercydes*. *There are*, says *Laertius*, *who affirm*, *that Thales was the first who held the Souls of Men to be immortal*^d, ἀθανάτους; which is an Epithet appropriated to the *Immortality of the Gods*, as ἀφθαρτος is to that of Men. The same Objection holds here against understanding it in the common Sense, as in the Case of *Phercydes*; besides we cannot doubt of the other Meaning, when we reflect on what the Ancients tell us of *Thales's* holding the Soul to be αὐτοκίνητον^e, a self moving Nature: That the World was animated, τὸν κόσμον ἐμψυχον, &c.^f. And that the Soul was Parcel of the Divine Substance^g.

The Sum then of the Argument is this: *Thales* and *Phercydes* are said to be the first who taught the *Immortality of the Soul*: — In the common Sense of this Assertion, they were not the first; and known not to be so by those who asserted it. — The same Antiquity informs us, they held the Doctrine of the ΤΟ ἝΝ, which likewise commonly went by the Name of the Doctrine of the *Immortality*. Nor is any earlier on Record than they, for holding that Principle. We conclude therefore, that those who tell us they were the first who taught the

^c Αὐτὸν δὲ, οὐκ ἐχρηξέναι καθ' ἑαυτὴν. Voc. Περικυδ.

^d ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸν πρῶτον εἰπεῖν φασὶν ἀθανάτους τὰς ψυχάς.

l. i. § 24.

^e Plut. Plac. Phil. l. 4. c. 2.

^f Laert. l. i. § 27.

^g Cicer. Consol.

Immortality of the Soul, necessarily meant that they were the first who held it to be *Part of the Divine Substance*.

3. But though the *Greeks* were the Inventers of this impious Notion, we may be assured, as they had their first Learning from *Egypt*, that some *Egyptian* Principles led them into it. Let us see then what those Principles were.

The *Egyptians*, as we are informed by the unanimous Testimony of Antiquity, were amongst the first that taught the *Immortality of the Soul*. And this not like the *Greek* Sophists, to speculate upon; but for a Foundation to their practical Doctrine of a future State of Reward and Punishment, which could not, without *that*, have its due Efficacy. And every thing being done in *Egypt* for the Sake of Society, a future State of Reward and Punishment was enforced to secure the general Doctrine of Providence. But still there would remain great Difficulties concerning the Origin of Evil, that seemed to affect the moral Attributes of God. And it was not enough for the Purposes of Society, that there was a Divine Providence, unless that Providence was understood to be administered by a perfectly good and just Being. Some Solution therefore was to be found out; and a better the *Egyptians* could not well think of, than the Notion of the *Metempsychosis*, or Transmigration of Souls, without which, in the Opinion of *Hierocles*^b, the Ways of Providence cannot be justified. The necessary Consequence of this Doctrine was, that the Soul is elder than the Body: So having taught before, that the Soul was eternal, *a parte post*; and now, that it had an Existence before it came into the Body, the *Greeks*, to give a Roundness to their Sy-

^b *Lib. de Prov. apud Phot. Bib. Cod. 215.*

stem, taught on the Foundation of that Pre-existence, that it was eternal too, *a parte ante*.

Having thus given it *one* of the Attributes of the Divinity, another *Egyptian* Doctrine soon taught them to make a perfect *God Almighty* of it.

We have observed, that the *Mysteries* were an *Egyptian* Invention; and that the *Secrets* of them were the *Unity of the Godhead*. These were the grand *Συμβόλια*, in which we are told, their Kings, and Magistrates, and a select Number of the Best and Wisest were instructed. This shews, the Doctrine was delivered in such a Manner, as was most useful to Society; but the Principle of the TO' 'EN is as destructive to Society, as Atheism can make it. — However they had no gross Conceptions of the Deity, when they had *found* him; but represented him, as we are told by the Ancients, *as a Spirit diffusing itself through the World, and intimately pervading all Things*^l. And thus, in a figurative moral Sense, saying, THAT GOD WAS ALL THINGS^k; the *Greeks* drew the Conclusion in a literal and metaphysical, THAT ALL THINGS WERE GOD^l; and so ran headlong into Spinozism; both which Expressions they afterwards father'd upon the *Egyptians*^m. And, if we may trust the general Opinion, *rightly* fathered them.

4. But the Books going under the Name of *Hermes Trismegistus*, having given the greatest Credit to this Opinion, it will be proper to explain that Matter.

The most virulent Enemies Christianity had, on its Appearance in the World, were the *Platonists*

^l Παρ' αὐτοῖς ἔστι παντὶς κόσμου τὸ διήκον ἡ πύσιμα. *Horapollo*.

^k Δοκεῖ αὐτοῖς διχα θεῶν μηδὲν ὅλως συνεστάναι. *Idem*.

^l In the Writings going under the Name of *Orpheus*, we find these Words: Ἐν τῇ τὰ πάντα.

^m The *Asclepian* Dialogue translated into Latin by *Apuleius*, says, *Nonne hoc dixi OMNIA UNUM ESSE, & UNUM OMNIA*.

and *Pythagoreans*. And national Paganism, of which they set up for the Defenders, being by its gross Absurdities, obnoxious to the most violent Retortion, their first Care was to cover and secure it, by *allegorizing* its Gods, and *spiritualizing* its Worship. But lest the Novelty of these Inventions should Discredit them, they endeavoured to persuade the World, that all they taught of the Principles of Religion, was agreeable to the ancient mysterious Wisdom of *Egypt*: In which Point, several Circumstances concurred to favour them. 1. As first, that known, uncontroverted Fact, that the *Greek* Religion and Philosophy came originally from *Egypt*. 2. The State of the *Egyptian* Philosophy in those Times. The Power of *Egypt* had been much shaken by the *Persians*, but totally subverted by the *Greeks*. Under the *Ptolemys*, this famous Nation suffering an entire Revolution in their Learning and Religion, the *Egyptian* Priests, as was natural, began to philosophise entirely in the *Grecian* Mode: And at the Time we speak of, had for several Ages, accustomed themselves so to do, having neglected and forgot all the old *Egyptian* Learning; which, considering their many subversive Revolutions, will not appear at all strange to those who reflect, that that Learning was conveyed from Hand to Hand, partly by Tradition, and partly by the mysterious Way of Hieroglyphics; the Knowledge of which was so soon lost, that those ancient Writers, who pretend to interpret them, do but just enough to shew us that they knew nothing of them. However a Pretence of being the Repositories of the true old *Egyptian* Wisdom, derived too much Honour to the Colleges of their Priests, not to contrive a Way to support it. 3. Which they did (and this leads me to the third favourable Circumstance)

stance) by forging Books under the Name of *Hermes Trismegistus*, the great Hero and Law-giver of the old *Egyptians*. This was a ready Expedient: for in the Times of the *Ptolemys* the Practice of forging Books became general, and the Art arrived to its utmost Perfection. But had not the *Greeks* of this Time been so universally infatuated with the Delusion of mistaking their own Philosophy for the old *Egyptian*, there were Marks enough to have detected the Forgery. *Jamblicus* says, *the Books that go under the Name of Hermes, do indeed contain the Hermaic Doctrines, THOUGH THEY OFTEN USE THE LANGUAGE OF THE PHILOSOPHERS. For they were translated out of the Egyptian Tongue by MEN NOT UNACQUAINTED WITH PHILOSOPHY*ⁿ. Whether this Writer saw the Cheat, or was in the Delusion, I can't say; but he has owned all we need desire of him; and made the Matter much worse by his Vindication.

Thus the later *Pythagoreans* and *Platonists* being supplied with this Prejudice, turned it the best they could against Christianity: Under these Auspices, *Jamblicus* composed the Book just before mentioned, *Of the Mysteries*; meaning the profound and recondite Doctrines of the *Egyptian* Philosophy: Which, at Bottom, is nothing else but the genuine *Greek* Philosophy, imbrowned with the Fanaticism of Eastern Cant.

But their chief Strength was in the forged Books of *Hermes*, which they added to, and interpolated, the better to serve their Purpose against Christianity.

ⁿ Τα ῥη. φερόμενα, ὡς Ἑρμῆ, ἑρμαινάς περὶ χεῖ δόξαι, εἰ καὶ τῶν φιλοσόφων γλῶττι πολλὰκις χρῆται· μετὰ γέγραπται ὅτι διὰ τὴν Αἰγυπτίαν γλῶττις ὑπὸ ἀνδρῶν φιλοσοφίας ὅσα ἀπεύρας ἔχοντες.
De Myst.

It is pleasant enough to observe how the primitive *Christians* defended themselves against the Authority of these Books. One would imagine they should have detected the Forgery; which, we see, was easy enough to do. Nothing like it: instead of that, they opposed Forgery to Forgery; and added themselves some Books to this noble Collection of *Trismegist*: For they too, as well as the *Pagans*, had their *Platonists* for such Services; who in these Books have made *Hermes* speak plainer of the Mysteries of Christianity, than ever the *Jewish* Prophets had done°.

Their

° But this was the Humour of the Times; for the Grammarians at the Height of their Reputation, under the *Ptolemys*, had shamefully neglected *Critical Learning*, which was their Province, to apply themselves to *forging Books* under the Names of old Authors. There is a remarkable Passage in *Diogenes Laertius*, which is obscure enough to deserve an Explanation, that will shew us how common it was to oppose Forgery to Forgery. He is arguing against those who gave the Origin of Philosophy, which he would have to be from *Greece*, to the *Barbarians*; that is, the *Egyptians*. Λαμβάνουσιν δ' αὐτὰς τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων καθοριστάματα, ἀφ' ὧν μὴ ὅτι γε φιλοσοφία, ἀλλὰ καὶ γένος ἀνθρώπων ἤρξηται, Βαρεδάργις προσηπτοῖσιν· ἰδὲ γὰρ ὡς οὐ μὲν Ἀθηναίοις γέγονε Μουσῆος, ὡς οὐ καὶ Θηβαίοις Λίνος; καὶ τῶν μὲν, Εὐμόλπου παῖδα, Φασι, ποιῆσθαι τὴν θεολογίαν καὶ σφαῖραν πρῶτον· φάναι τε ἐξ ἐνός τὰ πάντα ἡγείσθαι, καὶ εἰς ταῦτά τε ἀναλύεσθαι. 1. 1. § 3. But these erroneously apply to the Barbarians the illustrious Inventions of the Greeks; from whence not only Philosophy, but the very Race of Mankind had its Beginning. Thus we know Musæus was of Athens, and Linus of Thebes: The former of these, the Son of Eumolpus, is said to have wrote in Verse, of the Sphere, and of the Generation of the Gods: And to have taught, THAT ALL THINGS PROCEED FROM ONE, AND WILL BE RESOLVED BACK AGAIN INTO IT. To see the Force of this Reasoning, we must suppose, that those *Laertius* is here confuting, relied principally on this Argument, to prove that Philosophy came originally from the *Barbarians*; namely, that the great Principle of the *Greek* Philosophy, the *τὸ ἐν* and the *Refusion*, was an *Egyptian* Notion. To this he replies, not so: *Musæus* taught it originally in *Athens*. The Dispute we see is pleasantly conducted. His Adversaries, who supported the com-

mon,

Their playing *Trismegist* in this manner back upon their Enemies, puts us in Mind of that known Story of two Law Solicitors: The one had forged a Bond against the other, who instead of losing Time to detect the Knavery, chose rather to find evidence to prove that he had discharged it at the Day.

These are my Sentiments of the Imposture: *Cassaubon* supposes the whole a Forgery of some *Platonic Christians*. But *Cudworth* has fully shewn the Weakness of that Opinion: This latter Author is sometimes inclined to give them to the *Pagan Platonists* of those Times: which seems highly improbable.

1. Because they are always mentioned, both by *Christian* and *Pagan* Writers, as Works long known, and of some considerable standing. 2. Because had those *Platonists* been the Authors, they would not have delivered the Doctrine of the Soul's Consubstantiality with the Deity, and its Refusion into him, in the gross Manner in which we find it in the Books of *Trismegist*. For as we have shewn above by a Passage from *Porphyry*^p, they had confined that irreligious Notion to the Souls of Brutes. — At other Times, this great Critic seems disposed to think that they might indeed be genuine, and translated, as we see *Jamblicus* would have them, from old *Egyptian* Originals. But this, we presume, is sufficiently overthrown by what has been said above.

mon, and indeed, the true Opinion of Philosophy's coming first from the *Barbarians*, by the false Argument of the π 2's being originally *Egyptian*, took this on the Authority of the forged Books of *Trismegist*: And *Laertius* opposes it by as great a Forgery, the Fragments that went under the Name of *Musæus*.

^p See Note (m) p. 393.

In a Word, these Forgeries passing unsuspected on all Hands, and containing the rankest *Spinozism*^a, it went currently at that Time for an *Egyptian* Principle: And though, since the Revival of Learning, the Cheat has been detected, yet that Notion of the Original has kept its Ground; partly for the Reasons mentioned before, and partly, perhaps, on account of what we are told by modern Travellers, of the present Eastern *Pagan* Philosophy (whose Original may be easily proved to have been *Egyptian*) which they say, has run into the grossest *Spinozism*. But length of Time and Communication with the first *Mahometan* *Arabians*, who had learnt their Philosophy of the *Greeks*, and were distinguished for the Profession of this Principle, evidently led the modern Eastern People into these ill Conclusions of refined Speculation; which will appear the more Probable from hence, that the *Druid*, another Branch from *Egypt*, who became ex-

^a As in the following Passage: 'Οὐκ ἦκαστος ἐν τοῖς Γενικοῖς, ἐπὶ ἀπὸ μιᾶς ψυχῆς τὸ ὅσων παύται αἱ ψυχαὶ εἶναι; — As where it is affirmed of the World, πάντα ποιῶν, καὶ εἰς εἰαυτὸν διαρκεῖν. — Of the Incorruptibility of the Soul, πῶς μέλλει τι δουλείας φθαεῖναι ὃ ἀθάνατον, ἢ ἀκλίστου τι ὃ θείον; — ὁ γὰρ εἷς ἐστὶν ἀπείρητος καὶ ἀσύντμος; ὃ θεὸς, ἀλλ' ὅπως ἡπλωμένος κλυβατέ; τι ὃ ἡγε φῶς. — Of God, μόρια ὃ θεὸς πάντα εἶναι εἰ ὃ πάντα μόρια, πάντα ὅσα ὁ θεός; πάντα δι' αὐτὸν ποιῶν. — ἰάν τις ἐπιχειρήσῃ τὸ πᾶν καὶ ἐν χειρὶ αἰνῇ, τὸ πᾶν ὃ ἐνὶ λυγρῇ ἀπολέσει τὸ πᾶν, πάντα γὰρ ἐν ὃ θεῷ. This last Passage cannot be well understood without recollecting what we have observed above: "That the *Egyptians* saying, in a figurative "moral Sense, that *God was all Things*; the *Greeks* drew the "Conclusion in a literal and metaphysical, that *all Things were* "God." Now the *Platonist*, who forged these Books, being conscious, that this was a *Greek Conclusion*, artfully endeavours in the Words above, to shew it a necessary Consequence of the *Egyptian Position*, which conveyed an imperfect Representation of the Universe without it. *If any one* (says he) *go about to separate the All from the One, he will destroy the All, for all ought to be one.*

tingt before they had time to refine and hypothesise, held nothing that approached to this Opinion.

Why I have been thus solicitous in vindicating the *Egyptian* Wisdom from this Opprobrium, will be seen in its Place.

And now, to sum up the general Argument of this last Section ; these two Errors in the metaphysical Speculations of the Philosophers, concerning *the Nature of God, and of the Soul*, were what necessarily kept them from giving credit to a Doctrine highly probable in itself, and rendered so, even by themselves, from many moral Considerations, perpetually preached up to the People. But, as we observed before, it was their ill Fate to be determined in their Opinions, rather by *metaphysical* than *moral* Arguments. This is best seen by comparing the Belief and Conduct of SOCRATES with the rest. He was singular, as we said before, in confining himself to the Study of Morality ; and as singular in believing the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments. What could be the Cause of this latter Singularity, but the former, of which it was a natural Consequence : For having thrown aside all other Speculations, he had nothing to mislead him. Whereas the rest of the Philosophers applying themselves, with a kind of Fanaticism, to Physics and Metaphysics, had drawn a Number of absurd, though subtil Conclusions, that directly opposed the Consequences of those moral Arguments. And as it is natural for Parents to be fondest of their weakest and most deformed Offspring, so these Men, as we said ; were always more swayed by their metaphysical than moral Conclusions.

Thus, as the Apostle PAUL divinely observes,
 PROFESSING THEMSELVES TO BE WISE, THEY
 BECAME

BECAME FOOLS^r. Well therefore might he warn his Followers lest they should *be spoiled through vain Philosophy*^s: And one of them, and he no small Fool neither, is upon Record for having been thus *spoiled*; SYNESIUS a *Platonist*, and Bishop of *Ptolemais*. This Man, forsooth, could not be brought to believe the *Christian Doctrine* of the Resurrection: And why? Because he believed the Soul to be before the Body; that is, eternal, *a parte ante*: And the Consequence of this, we have seen, was what disposed the *Platonists* to reject all future State of Rewards and Punishments. However, he was not for shaking Hands with Christianity, but would suppose some grand and profound Mystery to lie hid under the Scripture Account of the Resurrection. This again was in the very Spirit of *Plato*; who, as we are told by *Celsus*, concealed many sublime Things of this kind, under his popular Doctrine of a future State^t.

In Conclusion, it is but fit we should give the Reader some Account why we have been so long, and so particular on this Matter.

One Reason was (to mention no other at present) to obviate an Objection, that might possibly be urged against our Proof, of *The Divine Legation of MOSES*, from the Omission of a future State. For if now the Deists should say, and we know they are ready to say any thing, that *Moses did not propagate that Doctrine, because he did not believe it*; we have here an Answer ready: Having shewn from Fact, *that the not believing a Doctrine so useful to Society, was esteemed no Reason for the Legislator not to propagate it*.

^r *Rom. c. i. v. 22.*

^s *Coloss. c. ii. v. 8.*

^t See Note (") p. 356.

SECT. V.

BUT it will now perhaps be said, that though we have designed well, and hereby obviated an Objection arising from the present Question; yet we have incautiously done it by a Circumstance that seems to turn to the Discredit of the *Christian* Doctrine of a future State. For what can bear harder on the *Reasonableness* of that Doctrine, than that the best and wisest Persons of Antiquity did not believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments?

To this we reply,

1. That had we indeed contented ourselves with barely shewing, that the Philosophers rejected this Doctrine, without explaining the Grounds and Causes of their Disbelief, some slender Suspicion against the *Christian* Doctrine, arising from their Authority, might perhaps, have taken Possession of the weaker Sort of Minds. But when we have at large explained those Grounds, which, of all philosophic Tenets, are known to be the most absurd; and seen these stuck to, while the best moral Arguments in the World for it were overlooked and neglected, the Authority of their Conclusions loses all its Weight.

2. But secondly, we say, had we done nothing of all this, but left them in Possession of their whole Authority, it would have been found impertinent to the Point in Hand. The contrary Supposition has arisen on a foolish Error. Those, who mistake Christianity for *only a Republication of the Religion of Nature*, must of Course suppose, the Doctrine it teaches of a future State, to be one of those which natural Religion discovers. It would therefore seem a Discredit to that Republication,

had

had the Doctrine been investigable by human Reason; and some Men would be apt to think it was, when the Philosophers missed of it. But our holy Religion, as I hope to prove in the last Book, is quite another thing: And *this* will be seen to be a Consequence of its true Nature, that *its* Doctrine of a future State is not one of those which natural Religion teaches. The Authority of the Philosophers therefore, is here out of the Question.

3. But thirdly, it will be found hereafter, that this Fact is so far from weakening the Doctrines of Christianity, that it is one strong Argument for the Truth of that Dispensation.

4. But as we have often seen Writers deceived in their Representations of *Pagan* Antiquity, and while zealously busy in giving such as they imagined favourable to Christianity, have been all the Time diserving it; lest myself should be suspected of having fallen into the common Delusion; I shall beg leave, in the last Place, to shew, that it is just such a Face of Antiquity, as is here represented, that can possibly countenance our holy Religion. And that consequently, if what we have given be the *true*, it does much Service to it.

This will best appear by considering the two usual Views Men have had, and the consequent Methods they have pursued, in bringing in *Pagan* Antiquity into the Scene.

Their Design has been either to illustrate the *Reasonableness*, or the *Necessity* of Christianity.

If the first, their Way was to represent Antiquity, as Master of all the fundamental Truths our holy Religion has revealed. But as greatly as this Representation was supposed to serve their Purpose, the Infidels, we see, have joined Issue with them, and from this Fact, have endeavoured to shew, with much Plausibility of Reasoning, that there-
fore

fore Christianity was not necessary : And this very Advantage *Tindal* (fighting successfully under Cover of a Principle, which some modern Divines seemed to afford him, of Christianity's being only a Republication of the Religion of Nature) obtained against the great Dr. *Clarke*.

If their Design was to illustrate the *Necessity* of Christianity, they have then taken the other Course, and (perhaps, out of a Sense of the former Mischief) ran into the opposite Extreme ; in representing Antiquity as quite ignorant of the Principles of Religion, or moral Duty. Nay, not only that it knew nothing, but that nothing could be known : For that human Reason was too weak to make any Discoveries in these Matters. Consequently, *there was never any such thing as natural Religion* : And what Glimmerings of Knowledge Men had of this kind, were only the dying Sparks of primitive Tradition. Here again the Infidels turned their own Artillery upon them, in order to dismount that boasted *Reasonableness* of Christianity, on which they had so much insisted : For what room was there left to judge of it, after human Reason had been represented to be so weak and blind ?

Thus while they were contending for the *Reasonableness*, they destroyed the *Necessity* ; and while they urged the *Necessity*, they risked the *Reasonableness* of Christianity. And these Infidel Retortions had an irresistible Force on the Principles our Advocates went upon ; namely, that Christianity was only a Republication of a primitive Religion.

It appears then, that the only State of Antiquity, whose View gives solid Advantage to the *Christian* Cause, is such a one as shews natural Reason to be *clear* enough to perceive Truth, and the *Necessity* of its Deductions when proposed and shewn ; but not generally *strong* enough to discover
it,

it, and draw right Deductions from it. Just such a View we have given of Antiquity, as far as relates to the Point in Question ; which we presume to be the true, not only in that Point, but likewise with regard to the State of natural Religion in general : Where we find human Reason could penetrate very far into the essential Difference of Things ; but wanting the true Principles of Religion, the Ancients neither knew the Origin of Obligation, nor the Consequence of Obedience. Revelation has discovered those Principles, and we now wonder, that such Prodigies of Parts and Knowledge could commit the gross Absurdities, that are to be found in their best Treatises of Morality. Which yet does not hinder us from falling into a greater and worse Delusion. For seeing of late, several excellent Systems of Morals, under the Title of *the Principles of natural Religion*, that disclaim the Aid of Revelation, we are apt to think them indeed the Discoveries of natural Reason ; and so regard their Excellencies as an Objection to the *Necessity* of any farther Light. The Pretence is plausible ; but surely, there must be some Mistake at the Bottom ; and the immense Difference in Point of Perfection, between these *imaginary* Productions of Reason, and those *real* ones of the most learned Ancients, will increase our Suspicion. The Truth is, these modern System Writers had an Aid, which as they do not acknowledge, so I persuade myself, they did not perceive. This Aid were the true Principles of Religion, delivered by Revelation : Principles so clear and evident, that they are now mistaken to be amongst our first and simplest Ideas. But those who understand Antiquity, know the Matter to be far otherwise.

I cannot better illustrate the State and Condition of the *human Mind*, before Revelation, than by

by the following Instance: A Summary of the *Atomic* Philosophy is delivered in the *Theætetus* of *Plato*. Yet being delivered without its Principles, when *Plato's* Writings at the Revival of Learning, came to be studied and commented; this Passage remained altogether unintelligible: For there had been an Interruption in the Succession of that School for many Ages: And neither *Marsilius Ficinus*, nor *Serranus* could give any reasonable Account of it. But as soon as *Des Cartes* had revived that Philosophy, and excogitated its Principles anew, the Mist removed, and every one saw clearly (though *Cudworth*, I think, was the first who brought it into Observation) that *Plato* had given a curious and exact Account of that excellent Physiology. And *Des Cartes* was now thought by some, to have borrowed his original Ideas from thence; though, but for his Revival of the *Atomic* Principles, that Passage had remained in eternal Obscurity. Just so it was with respect to *human Knowledge*: had not Revelation discovered the true Principles of Religion, they had without doubt continued for ever unknown. Yet on Discovery, they appeared so consonant to *that* Knowledge, that Men were apt to mistake them for the Product of it.

SECT. VI.

WE have now gone through our second general Proposition; which was, THAT ALL MANKIND, ESPECIALLY THE MOST WISE AND LEARNED NATIONS OF ANTIQUITY, HAVE CONCURRED IN BELIEVING, AND TEACHING, THAT THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, WAS NECESSARY TO THE WELL-BEING OF SOCIETY. In doing this, we have presumed to enter the very *Penetralia* of Anti-

Antiquity, and expose its most venerable Secrets to open Day: Some parts of which having been accidentally, and obscurely seen by Owl Light, by such as *Toland, Blount, Coward*, and others of that execrable Crew, were imagined, as is natural for Objects seen in the Dusk, to wear strange Gigantic Shapes, to the Terror and Affrightment of many good *Christians*.

The ridiculous Use that these Men have made of what they did not understand, may perhaps revive in the Reader's Mind that stale atheistical Objection, that *Religion is only a CREATURE OF POLITICS*, a State Engine, invented by the Legislator, to draw the Knot of Civil Society the closer. And the rather, because that Objection being founded on the apparent Utility of Religion to Civil Policy; we may be supposed to have added much Strength to it, by shewing in this Work, in a fuller Manner than, I think, has been hitherto done, the Extent of that Utility, and the Legislator's large Sphere of Agency in applying it.

For thus stood the Case: I was to prove *Moses's* Divine Assistance, from his being ABLE to leave out of his Religion the Doctrine of a *future State*. This necessitated me to shew, that that Doctrine was *naturally* of the utmost Importance to Society. But of all the Arguments, by which it may be proved, the most generally satisfactory, if not the strongest, is the Conduct of the Legislators with regard thereto. Hence the long Detail of Circumstances in the second and third Books. But had I suspected this could afford any Shadow of Strength to the Cause of Infidelity, I should scarce have ventured on the Topic; but have left it to the excellent Author of *The Enquiry into the Meaning of Demoniacs*, to be put in its due Light, for the Refreshment of those, who, in such a Time of ge-
neral

neral Prepossession in Favour of Religion, are too apt to run into Superstition.

But indeed it not only served to the Purpose of my particular Question, but, appeared to me, to be one of the strongest, and least equivocal Proofs of the Truth of Religion in general; and to deserve, in that View only, to be minutely examined and insisted on. I therefore considered this Volume, and desire the Reader would so consider it, as a whole and separate Work of itself, *to prove the Truth of Religion in general, from its infinite Service to human Society*, though it be but the Introduction to the Truth of the *Mosaic*.

Let us examine it: Legislators have unanimously concurred in propagating Religion. This could be only from a Sense and Experience of its Utility, in which they could not be deceived: Religion therefore has a general Utility. We desire no more to establish its Truth.

Truth is productive of the good of the whole; and Truth only: for Falshood is productive of the Mischief of it: The first being the Observance of the Relations of Things, which Observance causes Happiness; and the latter, the Violation of those Relations, which Violation causes Misery. Wherever then we find universal Utility, we may certainly know it for the Product of Truth. But the Practice of Legislators shews us, that this Utility results from Religion: The Consequence is, *that Religion is true.*

However as the unanimous Concurrence of Legislators to support Religion, has furnished Matter for this poor Infidel Pretence, I shall take leave to examine it to the Bottom:

Our Adversaries are by no Means agreed amongst themselves: Some of them have denied the Truth of Religion, because it was of no Utility; others,

E c

because

because it was of so much. But commend me to the Man, who, out of pure genuine Spight to Religion, can employ these two contrary Systems together, without the Expence even of a Blush^u. However *that* most adhered to, is *the political Invention of Religion* for its Use: The other being only the idle Exercise of a few Dealers in Paradoxes.

We have begun this Volume with a Confutation of the first of these Systems, and shall now end it with an Examination of the other. For being driven from their first hold, by shewing the Usefulness of Religion, they preposterously retire into this, in order to recover their Ground.

Critias of *Athens*, one of the thirty Tyrants, and the most execrable of the Thirty, is at the Head of that Division; whose Principles he delivers in the most beautiful *Iambics*. His Words are to this Purpose: — “ There^w was a Time when Man lived

^u See *Blount's Anima Mundi*, and *Original of Idolatry*.

^w Ἦν χρόνος ἐν ᾧ ἀναίσιος ἀνθρώπων βίος καὶ συνεώδης, &c. *Apud Sext. Emp. adv. Phys.* c. 9. § 54. There are many various readings of this Fragment; and I have every where chose that which I thought the Right. — That *Critias* was the Author how much soever the Critics seem inclined to give it to *Euripides*, I make no Scruple to assert. The Difficulty lies here: *Sextus Empiricus* expressly gives it to *Critias*; and yet *Plutarch* is still more express for *Euripides*, names the *Play* it belonged to; and adds this farther Circumstance: That the Poet chose to vend his Impiety under the Character of *Sisyphus*, in order to keep clear of the Laws. Thus two of the most knowing and correct Writers of Antiquity are adjudged irreconcilable in a mere Matter of Fact. Mr. *Petit*, who has examined the Matter at large [*Observ. Miscel.* l. 1. c. 1.] declares for the Authority of *Plutarch*. And Mr. *Bayle* has fully shewn the Weakness of his Reasoning in support of *Plutarch's* Claim. [*Crit. Dict. Ar.* (*Critias*) *Rem. H.*] *Petit's* Solution is this, that there is an *Hiatus* in the Text of *Sextus*: that a Copist, from whom all the existent MSS. are derived, when he came to *Critias*, unwarily jumped over the Passage quoted from him, together with *Sextus's* Observation of *Euripides's* being in the same Sentiments, and so joined

“ like a Savage, without Government or Laws,
 “ the Minister and Executioner of Violence; when
 “ there was neither Reward annexed to Virtue,
 “ nor Punishment attendant upon Vice. After-

the Name of *Critias* and the *Iambics* of *Euripides* together. But this is plainly seen to be such a Liberty of conjecturing, as would unsettle all the Monuments of Antiquity. I take the true Solution of the Difficulty to be this : *Critias*, a Man, as the Ancients deliver him to us, of atheistic Principles, and a fine poetic Genius, composed these *Iambics* for the private Solace of his Fraternity ; which were not kept so close but that they got wind, and came to the Knowledge of *Euripides* : To whom the general Current of Antiquity conspires, in giving a very virtuous and religious Character, notwithstanding the iniquitous Insinuations of *Plutarch* to the Contrary. And the Tragic Poet, being to draw the Atheist *Sisyphus*, artfully projected to put these *Iambics* into his Mouth. For by this Means the Sentiments would be sure to be natural, as taken from Life ; and the Poet remain secure from the Danger of Broaching such Impieties. And admitting this, *Plutarch's* account becomes very reasonable ; who tells us, the Poet delivered this atheistic Doctrine by a dramatic Character, to evade the Justice of the *Areopagus*. But without this it cannot be admitted : For, thinly to cover Impiety by the mere Person of a *Drama*, which was an important Part in the Celebration of their Festivals, and under the exact Regulation of the Magistrate, was a poor Way of evading the Penetration and Severity of that tremendous Judicature ; how good a modern Shift soever it might be. But the giving the Verses of *Critias* to his Atheist, was a safe Way of keeping under Cover. For all Resentment must needs fall on the real Author ; especially when it was seen that they were produced solely for Condemnation, as will now be proved. Without doubt, the chief Motive *Euripides* had in this Contrivance, was the Satisfaction of exposing a very wicked Man ; in which he had no Apprehensions to deter him from his Adversary's Power ; for *Critias* was then a private Man, the *Sisyphus* being acted in the 91 Olymp. and the Tyranny of the Thirty not beginning till the latter End of the 93d. But what is above all (which indeed gave me the Hint of this Solution, and advances it beyond a Conjecture) the Genius and Cast of that particular *Drama* wonderfully favoured his Design : For it is remarkable that the *Sisyphus* was the last of a *Tetralogy* (τετραλογία τραγικῶν δεσμμάτων) or a satyric Tragedy, in which Species of Poetry, a Licence something resembling that of the *old Comedy*, of branding ill Citizens, was in-

“wards it appears, that Men invented Civil Laws
 “to be a Curb to Evil. From hence Justice pre-
 “sided over the human Race; Force became a
 “Slave to Right, and Punishment irremissibly pur-
 “sued the Transgressor. But when now the Laws
 “had restrained an open Violation of Right, Men
 “set upon contriving, how secretly to injure others.
 “And then it was, as I suppose, that some cun-
 “ning Politician, well-versed in the Knowledge
 “of Mankind, counterplotted this Design, by the
 “Invention of a Principle that would hold wicked
 “Men in awe, even when about to say, or think,
 “or act ill in private. And this was by bring-
 “ing in the Belief of a God; whom he taught to
 “be immortal, of infinite Knowledge and a Na-
 “ture superlatively excellent. This God, he told

indulged; and where the same Custom of parodying the Writings
 of other Poets was in Use. Admitting this to be the Case; it
 could not but be, that for a good while after, these Iambics
 would be quoted by some as *Critias's*, whose *Property* they were;
 and by others, as *Euripides's*, who had got the *Use*, and in
 whose Tragedy they were found; and by both with Reason.
 But in After-times this Matter was forgot, or not attended to;
 and then some took them for *Euripides's*, exclusive of the Right
 of *Critias*; and others on the Contrary. And as a Copist fan-
 cied *one* or *other* the Author, so he read the Text. Of this we
 have a remarkable Instance in the 35th V. where a Tran-
 scriber, imagining the Fragment to be the Tragic Poet's, chose
 to read,

“Οθεν τε λαμπρὸς ἀσείρως σείχει μύδρως”

Because this expresses the peculiar Physiology of *Anaxagoras*,
 the Preceptor of *Euripides*, which Mr. *Barnes* thought a con-
 vincing Proof of the Fragment's being really *his*: whereas that
 reading makes a Sense defective and impertinent; the *true* be-
 ing evidently this of *Grotius*:

Λαμπρὸς ἀσείρων σείχει χορὸς.

And thus, I suppose, *Plutarch* and *Sextus* may be well recon-
 ciled.

“them,

“ them, could hear and see every thing said and
“ done by Mortals here below: nor could the first
“ Conception of the most secret Wickedness be
“ concealed from him, of whose Nature Know-
“ ledge was the very Essence. Thus did our Poli-
“ tician, by inculcating these Notions, become the
“ Author of a Doctrine wonderfully taking, while
“ he hid Truth under the embroidered Veil of
“ Fiction. But to add Terror to their Reverence,
“ the Gods he said, inhabited that Place, which
“ he knew to be the Repository of all those Mor-
“ mo’s, and panic Horrors, which Man was so
“ dextrous at imagining, to fright himself withal,
“ while he adds fancied Miseries to a Life already
“ over-burthened with Disasters. That Place I
“ mean, where swift Coruscations of enkindled
“ Meteors, accompanied with horrid Bursts of
“ Thunder, run through the starry Vaults of Hea-
“ ven; the beautiful Fret-work of that wise old
“ Architect, *Time*. Where the confociated Troop
“ of shining Orbs perform their regular and be-
“ nignant Revolutions; and from whence refresh-
“ ing Showers descend to recreate the thirsty Earth.
“ Such was the Habitation he assigned for the
“ Gods; a Place most proper for the Discharge of
“ their Function: And these the Terrors he ap-
“ plied to circumvent secret Mischief; stifle Dis-
“ order in the Seeds; give his Laws fair play; and
“ *introduce Religion so necessary to the Magistrate.* —
“ This, in my Opinion, was the Trick, whereby
“ mortal Man was first brought to believe that
“ there were immortal Natures.”

How excellent a thing is Justice, said some-
body or other, on observing it to be practised in
the Dens of Robbers. How useful, how necessa-
ry a Thing is Religion, may we say, when it for-

ces this Confession of its Power, from its two most mortal Enemies, a Tyrant and an Atheist.

The Account here given of RELIGION is, that it was A STATE INVENTION: That is, that the *Idea* of the Relation, between the Creature and Creator was formed and contrived by Politicians to keep Men in Awe: From whence the Infidel concludes it to be VISIONARY and GROUNDLESS.

I shall prove then in a very few Words, that the *Fact* or *Position* is 1st, IMPERTINENT, and 2dly, FALSE. For,

I. Was it true, as it certainly is not, that *Religion was invented by Statesmen*, it would not therefore follow that *Religion was false*. A Consequence that has, I dont know how, been wrongly taken for granted on all hands. It must be proved by one or other of these Mediums, or not at all.

1. Either *because Religion was not found out as a Truth, by the Use of Reason*.

2. Or, *because it was invented only for its Utility*.

3. Or Lastly, *because the Inventors did not believe it*.

I. *As to its not being found out as a Truth by the Use of Reason*, we are to consider, that the finding out a Truth by Reason, necessarily implies the Exercise of that Faculty, in proportion to the Importance and Difficulty of the Truth sought for: So that where Men do not use their Reason, Truths of the greatest Certainty and Use, will remain unknown. Nor are we used to reckon it any Objection to many obvious and common Truths, in which Religion is not concerned, that divers Savage Nations in *Afric* and *America*, remain yet ignorant of them.

Now the Objection against Religion, is founded on this pretended Fact, that the Legislator taught the People Religion from the most early Times.

And

And the Infidel System is, that Man from his first Appearance in the World, even to those early Times of his coming under the Hands of the Civil Magistrate, differed little from the Brutes in the Use of his rational Faculties; and that the Improvement of them was gradual and slow. For which the Records of Antiquity are appealed to, concerning the late Invention of the Arts of Life. Thus, according to their own account of Things, Religion was taught Mankind before the Generality began to cultivate their rational Faculties; and what is very remarkable, TAUGHT BY THOSE FEW THAT HAD.

It is true, our holy Religion gives a different Account of *these first Men*. But then it gives a more different Account of the *Origin of Religion*. And let our Adversaries prevaricate as they will, they must take both or neither. For what only could make the first Men so enlightened as Scripture represents them, was *Revelation*; and, that allowed, Dispute is at end.

If it should be said, that, supposing Religion true, it is of such Importance to Mankind, that we may well believe God would not suffer us to remain ignorant of it; I allow it. But then we are not to prescribe to the Almighty his Way of doing this. It is sufficient to justify his Providence, that it is done: Whether it be by *Revelation*; by the Exercise of *Reason*; or by the accidental Imposition of it, for oblique Ends by the *Civil Magistrate*.

And why it might not possibly happen to this Truth, as it hath done to many others of great Importance, to be first hit upon by Chance, and mistaken only for an Utility, and afterwards seen and demonstrated, I would beg leave to demand of these mighty Men of Reason.

2. *As to Religion's being invented only for its Utility*: This, though their palmary Argument, is

the most unlucky that ever was employed : It proceeds on a supposed Inconsistency between Utility and Truth. For Men perceiving much of this between private partial Utility and Truth, were absurdly brought to think there might be the same between general Utility and some Truths. Whereas general Utility and all Truths necessarily coincide. For Truth is nothing but that Relation of things, whose Observance is attended with universal Benefit. We may therefore as certainly conclude that *general Utility* is always founded on *Truth*, as that *Truth* is always productive of *general Utility*. Take then this Concession of the Atheist for granted, *that Religion is productive of public good*, and the very contrary to his Inference must follow ; namely, *that Religion is true*.

If it should be urged that Experience makes against this Reasoning ; for that it was not *Religion*, but *Superstition*, that for the most Part procured this public Utility ; and Superstition both Sides agree to be *erroneous* : To this we reply, that *Superstition* was so far from procuring any Good in the ancient World, where it was indeed more or less mixed with all the national Religions, that the Good which Religion procured, was allayed with Evil, in exact Proportion to the Quantity of Superstition found therein. And the less of Superstition there was in any national Religion, the happier we always find, *ceteris paribus*, was that People ; and the more there was of it, the unhappier. It could not be otherwise, for if we examine the Case, it will appear, that all those Advantages that result from the *Worship of a superior Being*, are the Consequences only of the *true Principles of Religion* : And that the Mischiefs that result from thence, are the Consequence only of the *False*, or what we call *Superstition*, *Superstition*, from our lax Use
of

of the Word, may be understood in two Senses: Either as a *Thing adventitious*, that is apt fatally to mix itself with Religion; or as a *corrupt Species of Religion*. In the first Sense, it is of no Use, but of infinite Mischief, and worse than Atheism itself. In the second Sense of a *corrupt Religion*, it is of *great Service* to Society; for by teaching a Providence, and the Dependence of Mankind upon it, it imposes a necessary Curb, that prevents Societies running into Confusion: and likewise of *great Mischief*: For by giving wrong Notions of the moral Attributes of God, it hinders the Progress of Virtue, or sets up a false Species of it. However, in this Sense of a *corrupt Religion*, it is infinitely preferable to Atheism. As in a sovereign Remedy, the Application of the *Drug*, though viciated, is greatly to be preferred in desperate Disorders, to the doing nothing; though it may produce evil Habits in the Constitution it preserves, which the sound *Ingredient* would have prevented. The Equivocation arising from this loose Use of the Word Superstition, was what furnished Mr. Bayle with the Means of drawing out his Apology for Atheism, and eluding the Pursuit of his Adversaries through so many voluminous Discourses.

3. As to the *Inventers not believing the Principle of Religion which they taught*: This comes with an ill Grace from an Atheist, who despises all Authority so much, as to oppose his own Singularities against the general Sense of Mankind, under Cover of an unquestioned Maxim, *That in Matters of Speculation, Reason and not Authority should determine our Judgments*. Was it true then, that the Inventors did not believe what they taught, this would be seen the poorest of all Arguments against its Truth.

But indeed the Supposition is without Foundation; and arises from gross Ignorance of the true Character

Character of the ancient Legislator. The Idea our Adversaries have formed of these Civilizers of Mankind (as we are but too apt, in our Representations of others, to copy from our own Natures) is of a *Species of dry, cold headed Cheats*, whose Capacity all arose from the Predominancy of their Phlegm. But the truly Learned in human Nature and Civil History, well know, that amongst the Infirmities of Heroes, a Deficiency of Faith is not one. On the Contrary, I may venture to affirm, there never was at any time a great Conqueror, or Founder of Civil Policy, or Religion, who carried on his Designs successfully by mere human Means, who was not naturally much inclined to *Enthusiasm*. The Observation is so certain, that I might defy our Adversaries to produce one single Instance throughout the whole Body of Civil History to the Contrary. Not that I suppose the Heat of Enthusiasm is not always tempered in Heroes with an equal Share of Craft and Policy. This extraordinary Mixture makes his true Character; a Character so much better conceived than expressed, that it has embarrassed the Pen even of a *Livy* to delineate; whose Picture of *Scipio Africanus* is, however, so very curious, that the learned Reader will not be displeased to find it in this Place: — “ *Quam ubi ab re tanto impetu acta solicitudinem curamque hominum animadvertit; advocata concione, ita de ætate sua imperioque mandato et bello quod gerendum esset, magno elatoque animo differuit, ut impleret homines certioris spei, quam quantam fides promissi humani aut ratio ex fiducia rerum subjicere solet. Fuit enim SCIPIO, non veris tantum virtutibus mirabilis, sed arte quoque quadam ab juvena in ostentationem earum compositus: pleraque apud multitudinem, aut per nocturnas visa species,*

“ *aut.*

“ aut velut divinitus, mente monita, agens: *sive*
 “ *ut ipse capti quadam superstitione animi, sive ut im-*
 “ *peria consiliaque velut sorte oraculi missa, sine cuncta-*
 “ *tione assequeretur.* Ad hæc jam inde ab initio præ-
 “ parans animos, ex quo togam virilem sumpsit,
 “ nullo die prius ullam publicam privatamque rem
 “ egit, quam in Capitolium iret, ingressusque ædem
 “ confideret: & plerumque tempus solus in secreto
 “ ibi tereret. Hic mos, qui per omnem vitam ser-
 “ vabatur, *seu consulto, seu temere,* vulgatæ opinioni
 “ fidem apud quosdam fecit, stirpis eum divinæ
 “ virum esse, retulitque famam, in Alexandro Ma-
 “ gno prius vulgatam, & vanitate & fabula parem,
 “ anguis immanis concubitu conceptum, & in cu-
 “ biculo matris ejus persæpe visam prodigii ejus
 “ speciem, interventuque hominum evolutam re-
 “ pente, atque ex oculis elapsam. His miraculis
 “ numquam ab ipso elusa fides est: quin potius
 “ aucta arte quadam, nec abnuendi tale quicquam,
 “ nec palam affirmandi^w.”

But the Necessity of this Conjunction, in him
 who would exceed in any grand Attempt of esta-
 blishing an *Empire*, or a *Religion*, appears plainly
 from the Nature of the Thing. Why a mere cold-
 headed Contriver, without any Tincture of natural
 Enthusiasm, can never succeed, is because such a
 one can never furnish out those surprizing Appear-
 ances, which a heated Imagination, working on a
 disordered, though, for this Purpose, fitly framed
 Constitution, so speciously produces, as to be
 esteemed the Effects of supernatural Power by the
 People, who are necessarily to be taken in; and
 whose Spirits can be only captivated by raising their
 Admiration, and keeping up their Confidence.
 Besides, *new Notions*, or *new Manners*, are never so

^w *Hist. lib. 26.*

readily received as when the Propagater is in earnest, and believes himself. For then there is something so natural in his Behaviour, as easily conciliates Opinions. Something so alluring, that it looks like a kind of natural Fascination ; which made an ingenious *French* Writer not scruple to say, “ *Donnez-moi une demi-douzaine de personnes, à qui je puisse persuader que ce n’est pas le Soleil qui fait le jour, je ne desespererai pas que des Nations entieres n’embrassent cette Opinion*”.

On the other Hand, a mere Enthusiast, who by Virtue of this Power, has gone so far in his Design, as to raise the Admiration, and captivate the Confidence of the People, must here fail for want of the other Quality. For his Enthusiasm not being under the Government of his Judgment, he will want the necessary Dexterity to apply the different Views, Tempers, and Constitutions of the People, now enflamed and ready to become his Instruments, to the Purpose he has in view.

But when these two Talents of Cunning and Enthusiasm unite to furnish out a Hero, great will be the Success of his Projects. The Sallies of Enthusiasm will be so corrected by his Cunning, as to strengthen and confirm his supernatural Pretences ; and the cold and slow Advances of a too cautious Policy, will be warmed and pushed forward by the Force of his Fanaticism. His Craft will enable him to elude the Enquiries and Objections of *the more Rational* ; and his Visions will irrecoverably captivate all *the warmer Noddles*. In a Word, they will mutually strengthen and enforce each others Power ; and cover and repair each others Defects. And indeed, there are so many powerful and opposite Interests to overcome and reconcile, so much Caprice

* *Fontanelle, Hist. des Oracles, cap. 11.*

and Humour to cajole, and artfully apply; that it is not strange, no man ever yet succeeded in any grand Design, where a whole People were the Instruments, that had not reconciled in himself, by a happy Union, these two seeming, and generally speaking, really incompatible Qualities.

I could here shew by an historical Deduction from ancient and modern Times, that all those Disturbers, or Benefactors of Mankind, who have succeeded in their Designs, did it by the joint Assistance of those two Qualities. And farther, that those, who are upon Record for having failed, were either *mere Enthusiasts*, who knew not how to push their Projects, when they had disposed the People to support them; or *mere Politicians*, who could never advance their wise Schemes so far, as to engage the People, by heating their Imaginations, to second them. But this, though greatly illustrating the Observation, would keep me too long from the Conclusion of the Volume, to which I am now hastening. I will only observe, that this high Enthusiasm was so conspicuous in the Character of ancient Heroism, and so powerful in making easy the most arduous Undertakings, that the learned Varro says, *It is of great Advantage to Society, that Heroes should believe themselves the Offspring of the Gods, whether indeed so or not. That by this Means, the Mind confiding in its divine Original, may rise above Humanity. So as more sublimely to project, more daringly to execute, and more happily to establish the grand Schemes it labours with, for the Service of Mankind.*

Utile est civitatibus, ut se viri fortes, etiamsi falsum sit, ex Diis genitos esse credant, ut eo modo animus humanus velut divinæ stirpis fiduciam gerens, res magnas aggrediendas præsumat audacius, agat vehementius, & ob hoc impleat ipsa securitate felicius. *Apud Aug. Civ. Dei, l. 3. c. 4.*

Hence

Hence it appears, that if Religion was a Cheat, the Legislators themselves were amongst the first that fell into the Deceit.

On the whole then we see, that of all these *Mediums*, whereby our Adversaries would infer, that Religion is false, because invented by Statesmen, the most to their Purpose, *proves nothing*. While of the other two, the first is a *high Presumption*, and the second a *Demonstration of its Truth*.

I have said, that it was, I dont know how, taken on all Hands for granted, *that the Invention of Religion by Politicians inferred its Falshood*. But on second Thoughts, I am persuaded the two great Facility in the Concession arose from hence. The popular Argument of the *innate Idea of God*, had been for Ages esteemed the fundamental Proof of his Being and Attributes: And the *political Origin of Religion* overthrowing *that Argument*, it was too hastily concluded that it overthrew the *Truth of Religion in general*; for Prejudice had established this Consequence, *if no innate Idea of God, no God at all*.

II. But now, though as we have shewn, the granting this Infidel Pretence, doth not at all affect the Truth of *natural Religion*; yet it does by Accident, and by Accident only, the Truth of *Revelation*: Because holy Scripture hath given us a different Account of the Origin of Divine Worship.

I shall shew therefore in the next Place, that the *Notion* is as *false and groundless*, as it hath been proved to be *impertinent*. First, by overturning the Grounds, on which it is built; and Secondly, by plain Matter of Fact.

I. The first of these Grounds is, *that the Legislator employed his utmost Pains and Labour in teaching, propagating, and establishing Religion*. But what can be

be concluded from hence more than this, that he did it from the clearest Conviction of its Utility? And how should he gain that Conviction, but from his having observed the Effects of its Influence on the Actions of Men? which must needs suppose him to have found, and not invented it.

If their Argument has any Weight, we must conclude the Magistrate was not only the Inventer of *natural Religion*, but of *natural Justice* likewise: For he took at least as much Pains in teaching, propagating, and establishing that. But will any one be so mad as to say, that Men in a State of Nature had no Ideas of *Justice*? Indeed, both one and the other had lost much of their Efficacy, when Men fled to the Civil Magistrate for Redress: And this explains the Reason why, on their entering into Society, the Legislator was always so intent upon Religion; namely, that he might recover it from the powerless Condition, to which it was then reduced.

It will be said, perhaps, that the Atheist does in fact contend for *natural Justice* being an Invention of Politicians as well as *Religion*. We have seen indeed, a Countryman of our own, who hath made it the Foundation of his Philosophy, that *Just* and *Unjust* arose from the Civil Magistrate. But then, he never imagined, that Men, before Society, had no Idea of these Things; all that he would contend for was, that their Idea was a false One.

2. The other, and *peculiar Ground*, our Adversaries go upon, is, *that the first and original Idolatry was the Worship of dead Men*: And those being certainly Legislators, Magistrates, and public Benefactors, it shews Religion to have been a political Institution. So amongst the Ancients, *Eubemerus*, surnamed *the Atheist*, wrote a Treatise to prove *the first Greek Gods were Men*; which *Tully*, who saw his

his Drift, rightly observed, would overturn all Religion². And so, amongst the Moderns, *Toland*, the pious Author of the *Pantheisticon*, wrote a Pamphlet with the very same Design, intitled, *Of the Origin of Idolatry, and Reasons of Heathenism*. It is not unpleasant to observe the Uniformity of Conduct in this noble Pair of Writers: which one never fails to find in Authors of a similar Character. *Eubemerus* pretended, his Design was only to expose the popular Religion of *Greece*; and *Toland*, that his was only pointed against Pagan Idolatry. While the real End of both, was the Destruction of Religion in general.

It must be owned, that this Ground, *of the first and original Idolatry*, has a Face of Plausibility. But then it has a Face only, being manifestly founded on this Sophism, that the *first Idolatry*, and the *first Religious Worship*, are one and the same thing. Whereas, it is not only possible that the *Worship of the first Cause* of all Things, was prior to any *Idol Worship*, but in the *highest Degree probable*; *Idol Worship* having none of the Appearances of an original Custom, and all the Circumstances attending a depraved and corrupted Institution.

But it being utterly false that the *Worship of dead Men* was the *primitive Idolatry*, we shall endeavour to convince these Men of a Fact they are so unwilling to see, or acknowledge.

I was pleased to find a Book, like this of *Toland's*, wrote posessedly on the Point, being in hopes to meet with something like Argument or Learning that would countenance a Disquisition: Because the examining any particular Author of this Class arrests the Attention of common Readers, better than general Reasoning, that goes more di-

² *Nat. deor.* l. i. c. 42.

rectly to the Fact, and determines the Question with more Precision. But I had the Mortification to meet with nothing there but a senseless Heap of Common-place Quotations from the Ancients, and a more senseless one of Common-place Reflections from modern Infidels; without the least Seasoning of Critic or Logic, to make it supportable. And the Authority of the Man, which is nothing, could not engage me to any farther Notice of his Book. But another, whose Authority stands highest in the learned World, and whose Heart was as unlike this Man's as his Head, seems to be of the same Opinion concerning the primitive Idolatry. It is the incomparable Sir *Isaac Newton* in his *Chronology of the Greeks*. His Words are these: — “*Æacus* the
 “ Son of *Ægina*, who was two Generations older
 “ than the *Trojan War*, is by some reputed one of
 “ the first who built a Temple in *Greece*. Oracles
 “ came first from *Egypt* into *Greece* about the same
 “ Time, as also did the Custom of forming the Images of the Gods, with their Legs bound up in the
 “ Shape of the *Egyptian Mummies*: For IDOLATRY began in *Chaldea* and *Egypt*, and spread
 “ thence, &c. — The Countries upon the *Tigris*,
 “ and the *Nile* being exceeding fertile, were first
 “ frequented by Mankind, and grew first into
 “ Kingdoms, and therefore began first to adore
 “ their dead Kings and Queens^a.” This great Man we see takes it for granted, that the *Worship of dead Men* was the first kind of Idolatry. And so only insinuates a Reason; namely, that the *Worship of dead Men* introduced Image *Worship*. For, the *Egyptians* first worshipped dead Men in Person, that is, their *Mummies*; which when lost, consumed, or destroyed, were worshipped by Representation, that is, under an Image made with its Legs bound up, in like-

^a *Chron. of anc. Kingdoms*, p. 160.

ness of the *Mummies*. The Reader now will be curious to know how *this* infers the *other*. All I can say to it is, that the excellent Author seems to have put the Change upon himself, in supposing *Image Worship* inseparably attendant on Idolatry in *general*; when it was but commonly so, on the *Species* in Question. For *Herodotus*, as we have seen before^b, tells us that the *Persians*, who worshipped the *celestial Bodies*, had no *Statues of their Gods*. Nor was *Image Worship*, as we say, *always* attendant on the other kind of Idolatry; for we learn from *Dionysius Hal.* that the *Romans*, whose Gods were *dead Men deified*, worshipped them for some Ages without Statues.

But to come closer to the Point: Our Adversaries quite overthrow their Position, on the very Entrance on the Question. The grand Symbol of the atheistic School is, that FEAR FIRST MADE GODS.

Primus in orbe Deos fecit timor.

And yet, if we will believe them, these first Gods were *dead Men*, deified for their *public Benefits* to their Country, or Mankind. *Not only* (says *Toland*) *Kings and Queens, great Generals and Legislators, the Patrons of Learning, Promoters of curious Arts, and Authors of useful Inventions, partook of this Honour; but also such private Persons, as by their virtuous Actions had distinguished themselves from others*^c. But to pass this over; their great Principle of FEAR is every way destructive of their System. For those very Ages of the World, in which *Fear* most prevailed, and was the predominant Passion of Mankind, were the Times before Civil Society; when every Man's Hand was against his Brother. If

^b See P. 96, Note (').

^c *Letters to Serena, Tract of the Origin of Idolatry, p. 73.*

Fear then was the Origin of Religion; Religion without question was before Civil Society.

But neither to insist upon this: Let us hear what the ancient *Theists* thought of the Matter. They said it was LOVE, and not *Fear*, that was the Origin of Religion. Thus *Seneca*: — “Nec in hunc
“furorem omnes mortales consensissent, alloquendi
“furda numina, & inefficaces deos; nisi nossent il-
“lorum beneficia nunc ultro oblata, nunc oranti-
“bus data; magna tempeſtiva ingentes minas in-
“terventu ſuo ſolventia. Quis eſt autem tam
“miſer, tam neglectus, quis tam duro fato, &
“in pœnam genitus, ut non tantam deorum
“munificentiam ſenſerit? Ipſos illos complorantes
“fortem ſuam, & querulos circumſpice, invenies
“non ex toto beneficiorum cœleſtium expertes;
“neminem eſſe, ad quem non aliquid ex illo be-
“nigniſſimo fonte manaverit^d.

But as *Hope* and *Fear*, *Love* and *Hatred*, are the grand Hinges, on which all human Actions and Cogitations turn, I ſuppoſe it was neither one nor other of theſe Paſſions alone, but both together, that opened to thoſe early Mortals (whoſe uncultivated Reaſon had not yet gained the *Knowledge*, or whoſe degenerate Manners had now loſt the *Tradition* of the true God) the firſt Idea of ſuperior Beings.

Such Men in a State of Nature, whoſe Subſiſtence was *immediately* to be ſupplied by the Product of the Earth, would be exact Obſervers of what facilitated or retarded thoſe Supplies: So that of Courſe, the grand genial Power of the System, that viſible God the *Sun*, would be ſoon regarded by them as a moſt beneficent Deity: and *Thunder* and *Lightning*, *Storms* and *Tempeſts*, which his Na-

^d *De Benef.* l. 4. c. 4.

ture produced, would be considered as the Effects of his Anger. The rest of the celestial Orbs would, in Proportion to their Use or Appearance, be regarded in the same Light. This is a very natural Account of the Original of Idolatry. That it is the true, we shall now shew.

1. Those ancient People of the North and South, the *Suevi*, *Arabs*, and *Africans*, who lived long uncivilized, and in Tribes, were all Worshipers of the celestial Bodies. The same appears to have been the Case of the *Chinese*, and those of *Mexico* and *Peru*, from what we observed before of their first Legislators pretending to be the Offspring of the Sun and Heaven. For we may be assured they had the Sense to chuse a well established Authority, to set up under.

2. But all Antiquity is unanimous in declaring that the first religious Adoration, paid to the Creature, was the Worship of Heavenly Bodies. This was so evident a Truth, and so universally owned, that *Critias* himself, as we see, was forced to allow it. And it being the entire overthrow of his System of the Origin of Religion, nothing but the falsest Evidence could have extorted that Confession from him.

To support so manifest a Point with a long Heap of Quotations, would be trifling with the Reader's Patience. But as *Greece* and *Egypt*, the two Countries where Civil Policy took deepest Root, and spread its largest Influence, had, by long Custom of deifying their public Benefactors, so erased the Memory of a prior Idolatry, as to have that by some Moderns deemed the first; I shall produce an ancient Testimony or two of the highest Credit, to shew that the Adoration of the celestial Bodies, was the first Idol Worship there, as well as in other Places.

3. IT APPEARS TO ME (says *Plato* in

in his *Cratylus*) THAT THE FIRST MEN WHO INHABITED GREECE, HELD THOSE ONLY TO BE GODS, WHICH MANY BARBARIANS AT PRESENT WORSHIP; NAMELY, THE SUN, MOON, EARTH, STARS, AND HEAVEN^c. The *Barbarians* here hinted at, were both those *in*, and *out* of Civil Society. As first, the civilized *Persians*, of whom *Herodotus* gives this Account: *They worship the Sun, Moon, and Earth, Fire, Water, and the Winds. And this Adoration they have all along paid from the very Beginning. Afterwards, indeed, they learned to worship Urania, &c^f*. And so goes on to speak of their later Idolatry of dead Mortals.

Secondly, the *Savage Africans*, of whom the same *Herodotus* says, — *They worship only the Sun and Moon; the same do all the Africans^g*.

2. *Diodorus Siculus*, speaking of the *Egyptians*, tells us, THAT THE FIRST MEN LOOKING UP TO THE WORLD ABOVE THEM, AND TERRIFIED AND STRUCK WITH ADMIRATION AT THE NATURE OF THE UNIVERSE, SUPPOSED THE SUN AND MOON TO BE THE PRINCIPAL AND ETERNAL GODS^h.

The Reason the Historian assigns, makes his Assertion general; and shews he believed this Idolatry to be the *first* every where else, as well as in *Egypt*. That it was so *there*, we have likewise

^c Φαίνονται μοι οἱ παῖδες τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὴν Ἑλλάδα τέττις μό-
νος θεὸς ἡγεῖσθαι, ἅπασι γὰρ πολλοὶ τὸ βαρβαρίζον, Ἥλιον, καὶ Σελή-
νην, καὶ Γῆν, καὶ Ἄστρον, καὶ Οὐρανόν.

^f Θύοις δὲ Ἥλιῳ τε καὶ Σελήνῃ, καὶ Γῇ, καὶ Πυρὶ, καὶ Ὑδαρὶ, καὶ
Ἀέροισι τῆτοις μὲν δὴ μένοισι θύοις ἀρχήθεν ἐπιμεμαθήκασι δὲ καὶ
τῇ Οὐρανῇ θύον, — I. 1. c. 131.

^g Θύοις δὲ Ἥλιῳ καὶ Σελήνῃ μένοισι τῆτοις μὲν γὰρ πάντες Λίβυες
θύοις I. 4. c. 188.

^h Τὸς Ἀιθίοπας τὸ παλαιὸν ἡγοῦντες ἀναβλέψαντας εἰς τὸ Κό-
σμον, καὶ τὸ ὅλον φύσιν, καταπληγῆτας καὶ θαυμάσαντας, ὑπολαβεῖν
τὸν θεὸν αἰεὶς τε καὶ παρῶν, τόντε Ἥλιον καὶ Σελήνην, — I. 1.

good internal evidence, from a Circumstance in their Hieroglyphics, the most ancient Method of recording Knowledge, where, as we are told by *Hor. Apollo, a Star denoted or expressed the Idea of the Deity*ⁱ.

What hath much embarrassed the Learned on this Question is, the not duly attending to the *Degrees and Manner*, by which, those early People superinduced the Worship of *dead Men*, to the primary idolatrous Worship of the heavenly Bodies; which I shall now endeavour to explain.

1. The first Step to the Apotheosis, was the complimenting their Heroes and public Benefactors, with the Name of that Being which was most esteemed and revered^k. Thus a King for his Beneficence, was called the Sun: and a Queen for her Beauty, the Moon. It is remarkable that this Way of Adulation still continues in use amongst the Eastern People; though in a lower Degree, it being now rather a *civil*, than a *religious* Compliment. But lest the Reader should suspect I talk without Book, I shall confirm what I say by no less an Authority than that of *Diodorus*, who tells us, that SOL FIRST REIGNED IN EGYPT; CALLED SO FROM THE LUMINARY OF THAT NAME IN THE HEAVENS^l.

2. As this Adulation advanced into an established Worship, they turned the Compliment the other Way; and now the Planet or Luminary was called after the Hero. I suppose, the better to ac-

ⁱ Ἀστὴρ παρ' Ἀρχαίων γαλαξίας; Οὐδὲν σημαίνει.

^k See P. 276, Note (i).

^l Πρῶτον μὲν Ἡλίου θεοὺς ὄντας ἔπειτα καὶ Ἀφροδίτης, ὁμάνουμον ὄντα τὰ κατ' ἐξῆς ἀνθρώπων. I make no question but it was from this Circumstance of *Egyptian* History, that the *Greeks* made the Fable of *Apollo's* being banished from Heaven, and coming and residing for some Time upon Earth.

custom the People, habituated to *Planet worship*, to this new Adoration. For this likewise I have the same Authority. *Diodorus*, in the Passage quoted a little before, having told us that the *Sun* and *Moon* were the first Gods of *Egypt*, adds THE FIRST OF WHICH THEY CALED OSIRIS, AND THE OTHER ISIS^m.

The Reader now sees, that by this *unbeeded*, but very natural Way of superinducing the one Idolatry upon the *other*, the two Species were entirely confounded. How long they continued so, and what Obscurity the endeavouring to clear up Matters, by supposing the one Idolatry to be only SYMBOLICAL of the other, has thrown on this Part of Antiquity, may be fully seen in *G. J. Vossius's* very learned Collection of *The Gentile Theology*. To explain this Matter at large would require a Volume: It is sufficient that we have given this Hint, which, if pursued, would open to us a clearer and more certain View of Things. But of all the Obscurities of Writers on this Question, nothing I think, equals the profound Nonsense of our *pantheistic Hero*. *The first Idolatry* (says he) *therefore did not proceed (as is commonly supposed) from the Beauty, or Order, or Influence of the Stars: but Men observing Books to perish [before they were any] by Fire, Worms, or Rotteness; and Iron, Brass, and Marble, not less subject to violent Hands, or the Injuries of the Weather, they imposed on the Stars (as the only everlasting Monuments) the proper Names of their Heroes, or of something memorable in their Historyⁿ.*

^m — Ὑπολαβεῖν ἦν θεὸς αἰδίδας τε καὶ πρῶτα, τόν τε Ἥλιον καὶ Σελήνην, ὧν τὸ μὲν Ὅσιον, τὸ δὲ Ἰσιν ὀνομάσαι. l. i. I presume the Reader will think a more intelligible Account is here given of these two obscure Passages of *Diodorus*, than is commonly to be met with amongst the Collectors.

ⁿ *The Origin of Idolatry, and Reasons of Heathenism*, p. 74.

Something the Man would say, but what, — I leave to his Followers to explain; and return to my Subject.

Thus, in shewing the Worship of *heavenly Bodies* to be prior to that of *dead Men*, we have not only overthrown *this* Argument, for the Proof of the *atheistic Notion of the Origin of Religion*, but likewise the Notion itself. For if (as our Adversaries own) the Worship of *dead Men* was the first religious Institution after entering into Civil Society; and if (as we have proved) the Worship of the *heavenly Bodies* preceded that of *dead Men*; the Consequence is, that Religion was in use before the Civil Magistrate was in Being. But we need not our Adversaries Concession for this Consequence: having proved from ancient Testimony, that *planetary Worship* was the only Idolatry *long before* Civil Society was known; and continued to be *so*, by all unpolicied Nations long after.

2. We come in the next Place to direct Fact: from whence it appears *that the Legislator, or Civil Magistrate, did not invent Religion.*

Here the Atheist's gross Prevarication ought not to pass uncensured. — From the Notoriety of the Magistrate's Care of *Religion*, he would conclude it to be *his Invention*. And yet, that very Antiquity which tells him *this*, as plainly and fully tells him *this other*; namely, *that Religion was not invented by him*. For look through all *Greek, Roman, or Barbarous Antiquity*; or look back on what we have extracted from thence, in the second Section of the foregoing Book, and it will appear to Demonstration, that not one single Legislator ever found a People, how barbarous soever, without a Religion, when he undertook the civilizing them. On the Contrary we see them all, even to the Lawgivers of the *Thracians and Americans*, addressing themselves

themselves to the Savage Tribes, with the Credentials of the God, there publicly acknowledged and adored. But the Truth of this will be farther seen from hence: It appears from the History of the Legislators, from the Sayings recorded of them, and from the Fragments of their Writings yet remaining, that they perceived the *Error* and *Mischief* of the gross Idolatries practised by those People, whom they reduced into Society. And yet, they never set upon reforming them: From which we necessarily conclude, that they found the People in Possession of a Religion that they could not unsettle: and so were forced to comply with old inveterate Prejudices. All they could do, when they could not purify the *Soul of Religion*, was more firmly to constitute the Body of it. And this they did by national Rites and Ceremonies. Indeed, in Course of time, though insensibly, the Genius of the Religion as we observed above, followed the Genius of the Civil Policy; and so grew better and purer, as it did in *Rome*; or more corrupt and abominable, as it did in *Syria*. But had the Legislators given an entire new Religion, as they gave Laws, we should have found some of them, at least, early approaching to the Purity of natural Religion. But as we see no such, we must conclude they found Religion, and did not make it.

WE HAVE now at length gone through our two first Propositions:

1. THAT THE INCULCATING THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, IS NECESSARY TO THE WELL-BEING OF CIVIL SOCIETY.

2. THAT ALL MANKIND, ESPECIALLY THE MOST WISE AND LEARNED NATIONS OF ANTIQUITY, HAVE CONCURRED IN BELIEVING, AND TEACHING, THAT THIS DOCTRINE WAS OF SUCH USE TO CIVIL SOCIETY.

Our next Volume begins with the Proof of the third; namely,

3. THAT THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, IS NOT TO BE FOUND IN, NOR DID MAKE PART OF THE MO-SAIC DISPENSATION.

Hitherto we have been forced to move slowly, to grope our Way in the Dark, through the thick Confusion of many irrational Religions, and mad Schemes of Philosophy, independent of, and inconsistent with one another. Where the Labour of the Search, I am afraid, has been much greater to the Author, than the Pleasure will be to the Reader, in finding this Chaos reduced to some kind of Order; the *Principles* discovered, from whence the endless Diversity and Contradiction have arose; and the various Use to be made of all this, for the Service of our holy Religion.

We now emerge into open Day:

*Majus rerum mihi nascitur Ordo,
Majus opus moveo.*

And having got the *promised Land* in view, our Labour will be much easier, as the Discoveries will be more important, and the Subject infinitely more interesting. For having now only one single System and Dispensation to explain, consistent in all its Parts, and absolute and perfect in the whole (which
though

though, by Reason of the profound and sublime Views of its Author, may have long remained unpenetrated, yet (if we have but the Happiness to enter rightly) we shall go on with Ease, and the Prospect will gradually open and enlarge itself; till we see it lost again in that *Immensity* from which it first arose.

Full of these Hopes, and under the Auspices of these Encouragements, let us now shift the Scene from *Gentile* to *Jewish* Antiquity; and prepare ourselves for the Opening of a more august and solemn Representation.

The End of the third Book.

ADDENDA to the ERRATA.

PAGE 423, Line 19, for *and that allowed Dispute* read *and that allowed, the Dispute* — p. 427, l. 22, for *exceed* r. *succeed* — p. 430, l. 13, for *1200* r. *100*.

*Just published, Printed for FLETCHER GYLES
against GRAY'S-INN in HOLBORN.*

THE *Alliance between Church and State, or, the Necessity and Equity of an Established Religion, and a Test-Law demonstrated.* by WILLIAM WARBURTON, A M. Octavo.

CONCILIA MAGNÆ BRITANNIÆ, & HIBERNIÆ: A Synodo Verolamienſi, A. D. 446. ad Londinenſem, A. D. 1717. Accedunt Constitutiones & alia ad Historiam Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ spectantia, a DAVIDE WILKINS, S. T. P. Archidiacono Suffolciensi Collecta in quatuor Voluminibus. Folio.

In this Work are included both the Volumes of Sir *H. Spelman's Councils*, which were so scarce, that they have been sold for *Ten Guineas*.

Dr. THOMAS BRETT's General History of the World, from the Creation to the Destruction of *Jerusalem* by *Nebuchadnezzar*: Being the Period with which the Old Testament concludes. Wherein the Sacred and Profane History is connected, the *Septuagint* and *Hebrew* Chronology compared, and adjusted to the Years before Christ. Octavo.

Dr. THOMAS BRETT's Chronological Essay on the Sacred History from the Creation of the World, to the Birth of Christ. To which is added, An Appendix on the Confusion of Languages, and a Discussion of that Question, *Whether the Primitive Language be any where remaining*. Octavo.

Historia Placitorum Coronæ, The History of the Pleas of the Crown, by Sir MAT. HALE, Kt. sometime Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King's-Bench. Now first published from his Lordship's Original Manuscript, and the several References to the Records examined by the Originals; *with large Notes*. by SOLLUM EMLYN of *Lincoln's-Inn* Esq; To which is added, a Table of the principal Matters, 2 vol. Folio.

FLETA, seu Commentarius juris Anglicani, partim e Codice MS. COTTONIANO, partim ex Rotulis Antiquis, & veterrimis tam Historiæ quam Legum Angliæ Scriptoribus emendatus, illustratus & in integrum restitutus, *Liber Primus Antiqua Placita Coronæ Continens*, Folio.

The English Works of Sir HENRY SPELMAN, relating to the *Laws* and *Antiquities* of ENGLAND, with a curious Account of his Life, by EDMUND Lord Bishop of LONDON. Folio

An *Essay on Human Life*, a Poem, by the Right Honourable Lord PACETT, third Edition *corrected and much enlarged*, by the AUTHOR. Octavo.

My has this book been rolled of the
of covering pages 226 & 227?

